The Gospel of the Resurrection

James Morris Whiton

WHITON

REFERENCE LIBRARY * HOUGHTON MIFFLIN CO. * BOSTON
Archive
Collection
This book may not leave the Office
and if borrowed must be returned within 7 days

THE GOSPEL

OF

THE RESURRECTION.

BY

JAMES MORRIS WHITON, PH. D.

Office Copy

Not to be Sold

BOSTON:
HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND COMPANY.
The Riverside Press, Cambridge.
1881.

Copyright, 1881,
By JAMES M. WHITON.

All rights reserved.

The Riverside Press, Cambridge:
Stereotyped and Printed by H. O. Houghton & Co.

To the

BROTHERHOOD OF THE BEREAVED,

who long to know all that may be known

of the

STATE OF THE DEAD,

These Studies upon the Resurrection

are dedicated

by

ONE OF THEIR NUMBER.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTERS.		PAGE
I.	The Present Difficulty — Christian Thought outgrowing the Creeds	11
	Note A. — The Testimony of the Principal Christian Creeds	24
	Note B. — The Opinions of the Jews concerning the Resurrection	34
II.	The Resurrection a Continuous Reality	38
	Note A. — Christ's Argument with the Sadducees. — *Luke* xx. 34–38	49
	Note B. — Resurrection now and henceforth. — *John* v. 24–29	51
III.	The Resurrection Exemplified in the Risen Christ	56
	Note A. — Christ's Resurrection not completely manifested till his Ascension. — *John* xx. 14–17	69
	Note B. — Resurrection distinct from Reanimation. — 1 *Cor.* xv. 20	72
	Note C. — The Resurrection of the Jewish Saints. — *Matt.* xxvii. 51–53	73
	Note D. — Where was Christ between his Death and Resurrection? — *Luke* xxiii. 43	75
	Note E. — Mortal Bodies quickened. — *Rom.* viii. 10–14	78
	Note F. — The Redemption of our Body. — *Rom.* viii. 23	81
IV.	The Resurrection an Object of Christian Endeavor, Attained at Death	83
	Note A. — Anastasis and Exanastasis. — *Phil.* iii. 11	102
	Note B. — Augustine's view of Future Punishment	103

V. The Coming of Christ in his Kingdom a Reality of the Past, the Present, and the Future 105
Note A. — "The Regeneration." — *Matt.* xix. 28 127
Note B. — The Angels' Prophecy of Christ's Coming. — *Acts* i. 10, 11 130
Note C. — The Resurrection at Christ's Coming. — 1 *Cor.* xv. 22, 23 133
VI. Judgment a Present and Perpetual Reality in both Worlds 139
Note. — Judgment as represented in the Creeds . 154
VII. The Last Judgment not Delayed till the Resurrection 157
VIII. Particulars Elucidated by Principles . 187
Note A. — Resurrection a Reality prior to the Historical Appearance of Christ. — 1 *Cor.* xv. 20 217
Note B. — The Doctrine of a Past Resurrection. — 2 *Tim.* ii. 18 218
Note C. — David's Resurrection. — *Acts* ii. 34 . 220
Note D. — The End of the World at the Day of the Lord. — 2 *Pet.* iii. 10–13 222
IX. The Resurrection a Development, not a Miracle 224
Note A. — The "Thousand Years," or "The Millennium." — *Rev.* xx. 4 250
Note B. — "The First Resurrection." — *Rev.* xx. 5 253
Note C. — The Binding and Loosing of Satan, connected in Prophecy with the First Resurrection. — *Rev.* xx. 1-3, 7-9 255
Note D. — "The End" — "God All in all." — 1 *Cor.* xv. 24-28 261
X. Summary and Conclusion 265

PREFACE.

WHAT the Scriptures say, as distinguished from what they seem to say, or have been supposed to say, is an inquiry which Christian study must continually prosecute. Probably no subject can be named upon which a greater variety and a greater uncertainty of belief prevail than the Resurrection, its nature, its time, and its manner. The subject is, indeed, of such a nature that a careful thinker must often decline the conjectures of speculation, and wait for the disclosures of experience. And yet some positive statements have been made by Divine Revelation. To read these out of the Scriptures, as far as they go, carefully separating them from the opinions and glosses that have been read into them, is an undertaking from which we may

expect good results. The vagueness and bewilderment that seem to embarrass Christian thought upon the Resurrection apparently demand a scholarly reinvestigation of the subject, whose results shall be put in a condensed and comparatively popular form for general reading.

Such an attempt is, however, beset with difficulty, partly by the inseparable connection of the subject with such doctrines as that of the so-called "Second Advent of Christ," and the "Last Judgment," — partly by the abundance of texts which make dark corners for difficulty to retreat to when cleared away from the main path. As to the latter, the broom has been carried into such corners by critical notes appended to the successive chapters, so as to leave the main course of thought unincumbered for the reader. As to the former, it has been necessary to devote three chapters to an exposition of the indissolubly cohering subjects of the Advent and the Judgment. Those readers who are not at once discour-

aged by this statement, remembering what wearisome fiction and absurdity have been spread upon these subjects, will probably find these chapters quite as interesting as any portion of the book. Controversy, however, is not now in hand, but earnest and candid inquiry into the precious things of the Christian Hope. Where this involves criticism of untenable fictions and decaying beliefs, it surely ought not to be spared.

The larger portion of the following pages has been given, in another form, to my own congregation, especially at the Easter season. Their interest in hearing and reiterated requests for publication have led me to offer these studies, after thorough elaboration, to the wider circle of all who are thoughtfully questioning about the Resurrection, *when? what?* and *how?*

NEWARK, N. J., *February* 16, 1881.

THE

GOSPEL OF THE RESURRECTION.

CHAPTER I.

THE PRESENT DIFFICULTY: CHRISTIAN THOUGHT OUTGROWING THE CREEDS.

"They all shall wax old as doth a garment."—*Hebrews* i. 11.

WHOEVER will take the trouble to glance at the testimony of the principal creeds, as cited in the following pages, will be made aware of a wide difference between their testimony on the subject of the resurrection and the views which are gaining predominance among educated people. It is a misfortune that such a difference should exist even in appearance. The time-honored phrase of the most ancient of all the creeds, "I believe in the resurrection of the body," suggests the idea that the buried body is to be raised out of its grave, an idea which modern thought generally repudiates. This idea is not necessarily connected with that

venerable phrase,[1] but is so closely related to it as to require to be disavowed and dissociated from it. When, however, one finds on examination that this was the very idea which that phrase originally carried — "the resurrection of the *flesh*" (according to the exact translation of the original) — when one finds, moreover, other and more modern creeds affirming the resurrection of "the bodies," of "the self-same bodies and none other," it becomes apparent that the generality of Christian believers down to recent times have agreed in a belief which is now regarded as impossible by multitudes of thinking people both in the church and out of it. That this belief affects one of the cardinal doctrines of the Christian faith renders it all the more important to know whether it is the *substance* or only the *form* of the doctrine that is challenged. For so closely connected with each other are all the leading truths of the Christian system, that the loosening of faith in any one of them is speedily followed by a loosening hold on the rest.

It is a common mistake, both of skeptics and of believers, to identify the permanent

[1] See chapter iii.

substance of truth with the transient form in which, for the time, it is presented, and to imagine that if the form is untenable the substance is indefensible. Thus an outworn and untenable form of Christian doctrine may become a serious stumbling-block to intelligent minds, and a mischievous hindrance to the reception of the substance of Christian faith.

The interest of Christian thought has for some time been flowing in a stronger current toward the study of the Biblical testimony to "the things that shall be hereafter." Among these things the resurrection has always been classed. To those who are now or at any time living in this world, the resurrection is of course one of the future things. The belief has reigned throughout the Christian world from the time of Christ, and from before Christ's time among the Jews, that the resurrection is still future *to those in the world of the dead*, just as it is to those in the present state of being, — that it is an event to occur hereafter at the same moment to all mortals who have ever passed through the gate of death into the unseen. The general thought of Christian believers to-day is, that, at that

—— "far off Divine event,
To which the whole creation moves,"

the countless multitudes of the dead, till then waiting, disembodied, in some middle state, shall in a moment be clothed with bodies, which bodies are to be reconstituted out of some, at least, of the elements of the long since buried bodies which have returned to dust. This being done, these re-embodied spirits are to assemble before the judgment throne of the Christ, whose coming in visible glory has given the resurrection-call, and, after hearing their final sentence, to depart into their final state, either heaven or hell.

That the Christian world has for eighteen centuries been at rest in this belief will be to many a sufficient evidence of its truth. Those, however, who know that Christian study has hitherto been turned mainly upon other doctrines, will deem it not unlikely that study may make such improvements in the statement of this doctrine as it has confessedly made in the statement of others. Nor can any one whose desire it is to secure such statements of Christian doctrine as are most consonant with the teachings of Christ, least vulnerable to anti-Christian objections,

least puzzling to candid inquirers, and most strengthening to Christian hope, fail to regard with a benevolent fairness a sincere attempt, like this, in that direction.

But if the Christian world has rested for eighteen centuries in the doctrine of the resurrection above outlined, it is, as I think, not merely because study has been turned mainly upon other doctrines. Why has study of this doctrine, appealing as it does to our strongest hopes and fears, been so postponed? Not because there is any lack of material in the Holy Scriptures, which contain "the Gospel of the Resurrection." But rather, as I am disposed to think, because of certain *prejudgments*, which operated to foreclose the case. Such are these:

(1.) The resurrection pertains not to the present course of things, but to the far future. But may it not, though future to us, be present to those who have entered the unseen?

(2.) It is an *event* hereafter to be wrought by a catastrophic Divine power, operating by an external miracle, and simultaneously on all alike. But may it not be a *process*, continuously going on by uniformly working laws of spiritual growth, according to

individual endeavors and the resulting conditions?

(3.) Chiefly, however, this: the resurrection is to be the mighty work of Christ at his coming. But what if Christ, in the true significance of his promise, has already come, and is ever coming, in the power of his resurrection, with a constantly increasing glory?

Such, as I think, are the *prejudgments*, borrowed from Jewish believers[1] in a resurrection at the advent of the Messiah, which have operated to "seal the book" on this subject, as a subject on which no more can be known "till the time of the end."

Together with these prejudgments, false principles of interpretation have operated as a blind in the same direction.

One of these may be described as putting Paul before Christ, or rather, putting what we understand Paul to say before what every one may readily perceive that Christ has implied.

For instance, in Christ's argument with the Sadducees (see note A, chapter ii.), he considers it enough to prove that the dead *rise* by showing that the dead *live*. His ar-

[1] See Note B, appended to this chapter.

gument rests on the assumption that living after death and rising after death are equivalent terms. So, in his dialogue with Martha (see chapter ii.), he asserts a present agency as the Resurrection-Power in the same *emphatic present* tense in which he declares his present and perpetual activity for our salvation in other respects: "I AM the Resurrection and the Life." But Paul, in his letters to the Corinthians and Thessalonians, speaks of the resurrection as *future* (as indeed it must ever be to all on earth). And so we have discarded the obvious implication of the Master's teaching, that the resurrection is not that far-off and catastrophic event to all at once that Martha and her countrymen supposed. If we think we find an inconsistency between the present resurrection that Christ plainly implies, and the future resurrection that Paul prophesies, is it not the wiser way — whatever we are able to make of the Apostle's words — to put Christ before Paul, by accepting the Master's teachings, in their obvious and natural meaning, as the groundwork of our belief? We shall do this, unless we think we may rely on our understanding of the

Epistles better than on our understanding of the Gospels.

Another road to wrong conclusions seems to have been unhappily followed in all the controversies of Christian sects, namely, the suppressing of texts that look one way, and the magnifying of those that look the other. The Calvinist and the Arminian, the Lutheran and the Zwinglian, the Churchman and the Independent, the Trinitarian and the Unitarian, the Restorationist and the Annihilationist, have all had their favorite proof texts to hurl at each other. Where one party is weak the other is strong, and *vice versa*. The same opportunity exists on the subject of the resurrection for a Presentist and a Futurist view, in opposition to each other. To realize this opportunity, it is only needful to follow the track which almost all religious discussions have gone, namely, first, to make up one's mind, and then to look up proof texts. These can be found, or can be shaped for use, on both sides, both in the sayings of Christ and in the sayings of the Apostles. Paul is generally regarded as teaching the Futurist view, and yet he has spoken quite as emphatically for the Presentist.

"There *is* a spiritual body."

"So *is* the resurrection of the dead."

"It *is* raised in glory."

"We *have* the heavenly [house]."

These, and much more than these, the teachings of Christ, have been generally overlooked under the influence of a Jewish bias toward the Futurist view, which has assimilated to its own way of thinking whatever it could. And yet these testimonies are on the record, appealing to all whose study is to seek truth rather than to buttress opinions preconceived or inherited. Happily, the doctrine of the resurrection is one where such latitude of opinion is accorded within the limits of recognized orthodoxy, that the malign influence of religious timidity and theological suspicions need not be feared, as in some other directions, as likely to restrict the freedom and lessen the candor which are requisite to a fair hearing of both sides, in order to find that true point of view which includes all the facts, and does equal justice to apparently conflicting testimonies.

A third principle, absurd as well as false, which deserves notice, is the rejection, at sight, of whatever view, or interpretation

of a text, has been associated with names deemed unsound or heretical. I knew a Presbyterian minister, a thorough-going defender of the Nicene Creed, to be taken, in Mississippi, as a Unitarian, because of a sermon which he preached on the Humanity of Christ. And I am quite sure that, in the minds of such as follow this method of forming conclusions, the idea advanced in this volume, that the resurrection is now going on in the future state, will be scouted at once as "Swedenborgian." If it would be of any benefit to say it, I would say to such that I utterly dissent from the "Swedenborgian" view of Holy Scripture, and am no more a "Swedenborgian" than I am a Romanist, in however few or many particulars I may agree with each of those religious denominations. If one is conceited enough to assume that *his* "doxy" holds all the truth, and any other "doxy" holds none of it, then it will be a sure method, as well as a swift one, to dispose of this book by saying, "You're a Swedenborgian." And I shall be quite content, at this point, to leave all such readers where they belong, in the company of that "orthodox" church which the Rev. Mr. Murray describes in his

notorious lecture on "Deacons," as declaring that they would allow only *beef* sandwiches at their picnic, because the Unitarians used *ham* sandwiches.

Lastly, I am aware that some exception will be taken to any mode of studying this subject which refuses to be bound by the obvious sense in which the Apostles seem to have used the language which they employed in delivering their testimony to the fact. "It is time," says an able advocate of views which I criticise throughout this volume, "that the language of the Sacred Books should be used in its own sense, the sense which it is manifestly intended to convey." Yes, but *by whom* intended — by the human seer, or by the Spirit from whom the human seer derived his message? The limitation of the teaching of the Spirit of prophecy by the conceptions of the prophet is flatly against the declaration of Scripture, that "no prophecy is of any private interpretation" (2 Pet. i. 20), that is, limited by the mind of the individual interpreter. It is as absurd as to limit the ideas of a statesman by the ideas of the schoolboy who declaims the statesman's oration. The teaching power of the Divine Oracles is cut

down thereby to the measure of the minds that have transmitted them to us. The promise of our Lord that his Spirit, when come, should "guide into all truth," cannot be regarded as limited to the first generation of the church. Greater insight into "the things pertaining to the kingdom of God" than even Apostles possessed, who believed the final catastrophe of the physical heavens and earth to be imminent in their own lifetime, must be accorded to those who have the teaching of Christ's Spirit together with the commentary upon Christ's words which is furnished by the instructive experience of the Christian centuries.

The claim, however, that "the obvious sense" which we deem that any writer in the Scriptures must have attached to prophecies which we deem inspired, determines the sense which *we* must attach to them, may be tested by a case in which Christ himself has declared a prophecy to have been fulfilled. Malachi had prophesied the coming of "Elijah the prophet" before the coming of the Lord. Christ affirms that this was fulfilled in the advent of John the Baptist.

THE PROPHECY.	THE FULFILLMENT.
Behold I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the LORD. *Mal.* iv. 5.	For all the prophets and the law prophesied until John. And if ye will receive *it*, this is Elias, which was for to come. *Matt.* xi. 13, 14.

It is far most likely that Malachi and his contemporaries understood this prophecy as we know it was generally understood by the Scribes in Christ's time, in the sense of an actual return of the ancient Elijah. It was something that only experience could disclose, that the fulfillment would not be literal, but spiritual, by the coming not of Elijah, but of *an* Elijah who would come not in the form of Elijah but "in the spirit and power of Elijah." (Luke i. 17.) The Scribes, when they pressed against the claims of Jesus the prophecy that "Elias must first come" (Mark ix. 11), were simply holding to the literal and obvious sense, as contended for to-day. After such a failure it will not do to press their principle *in the interpretation of prophecy*, however we are sometimes required by the nature of the subject, as in precepts and in arguments, to insist upon it.

The object of these studies upon the resurrection is to redeem a vital Christian doctrine from obsolete and obsolescent crudities of statement which provoke skepticism, and to promote clearness and consistency in Christian thinking upon the great Christian hope, as based upon Christ's words of life. Thus it is hoped to contribute somewhat toward a thoroughly Biblical doctrine of the resurrection that shall be congruous with the best tendencies of modern thought.

NOTE A.

THE TESTIMONY OF THE PRINCIPAL CHRISTIAN CREEDS UPON THE DOCTRINE OF THE RESURRECTION.

The Apostles' Creed.

This was developed during the second century. Its testimony on this subject is comprised in the words: "He ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty. From thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead. I believe in . . . . the resurrection of the body and the life everlasting."

Irenæus (A. D. 180) uses the words: "his appearing from heaven in the glory of the Father . . . . to raise up all flesh of all mankind . . . . and that he

may execute righteous judgment over all." Tertullian (A. D. 200) uses the words: "coming to judge the quick and the dead also through the resurrection of the flesh." Also the following form: "He will come again with glory to take the saints into the enjoyment of eternal life and the celestial promises, and to judge the wicked with eternal fire, after the resuscitation of both, with the restitution of the flesh."

All the ancient forms of the Apostles' Creed which refer to the resurrection of mankind use the phrase σαρκὸς ἀνάστασιν, "carnis resurrectionem," *the resurrection of the flesh.* See Table in Schaff's *Creeds of Christendom*, ii. pp. 52–55, covering the period from 200 to 650, A. D.

The Nicæno Constantinopolitan Creed, A. D. 381.

[Consented to by all Trinitarian churches, — Greek, Roman, Protestant.]

— He shall come again with glory to judge both the quick and the dead; whose kingdom shall have no end. . . . . And I look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come.

The Athanasian Creed.

[Originating probably in the seventh century, and current mostly in the Catholic churches of Western Europe.]

— He ascended into heaven, he sitteth on the right hand of the Father God Almighty, from whence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead. At whose coming all men shall rise again with their bodies, and shall give account for their own works.

And they that have done good shall go into life everlasting, and they that have done evil into everlasting fire.

The Council of Trent, A. D. 1563.

This is the authoritative exponent of Roman Catholicism, and bears testimony on this subject only in reaffirming the words of the Nicæno Constantinopolitan Creed, quoted above.

The Orthodox Confession of the Eastern Church A. D. 1643.

[Setting forth the faith of the Greek (and Russian) Church.]

Q. CXX. What is the eleventh Article of the faith?

A. I look for the resurrection of the dead.

Q. CXXI. What does this Article of the faith teach?

A. It teaches positively and with perfect truth, that there will be a resuscitation of human bodies, alike of the righteous and the wicked, from the death that has passed upon them. . . . . Moreover they shall be altogether the same bodies with which they have lived in this world.

The confession of the Eastern Church, above quoted, is in the form of a *catechism* upon the ancient Nicene Creed, as the quotation shows. Somewhat more explicit we find —

The Longer Catechism of the Eastern Church, A. D. 1839.

Q. 367. How shall the body rise again, after it has rotted and perished in the ground?

A. Since God formed the body from the ground originally, he can equally restore it after it has perished in the ground. The Apostle Paul illustrates this by the analogy of a grain of seed, which rots in the earth, but from which there springs up afterwards a plant or tree.

Q. 369. When shall the resurrection of the dead be?

A. At the end of this visible world.

According to the statements of this Catechism, the resurrection is to be ushered in by the coming of Christ in visible glory, to execute judgment upon all mankind.

Luther's Small Catechism, A. D. 1529.

[In use among the Lutheran churches of America.]

This, besides teaching the Apostles' Creed, teaches upon it the comment that Christ "will raise up me and all the dead at the last day, and will grant everlasting life to me and to all who believe in Christ."

The Scotch Confession, A. D. 1560.

ART. XXV.

. . . . Secondly, in the general judgment there shall be given to every man and woman resurrection of the flesh. For the sea shall give her dead; the earth, they that be therein enclosed; yea, the Eternal our God shall stretch out his hand on the dust, and the dead shall arise incorruptible, and that in the substance of the self-same flesh that every man now bears, to receive according to their works, glory or punishment, etc.

The Belgic Confession, A. D. 1561.

[Of the Reformed (Dutch) Church in America.]

ART. XXXVII. OF THE LAST JUDGMENT.

Finally, we believe, according to the Word of God, when the time appointed by the Lord (which is unknown to all creatures) is come, and the number of the elect complete, that our Lord Jesus Christ will come from heaven, corporally and visibly, as he ascended, with great glory and majesty, to declare Himself Judge of the quick and dead, burning this old world with fire and flame to cleanse it. And then all men will personally appear before this great Judge, both men and women, and children, that have been from the beginning of the world to the end thereof, being summoned by the voice of the archangel, and by the sound of the trumpet of God. For all the dead shall be raised out of the earth, and their souls joined and united with their proper bodies in which they formerly lived. As for those who shall then be living, they shall not die as the others, but be changed in the twinkling of an eye, and from corruptible become incorruptible. Then the books (that is to say, the consciences) shall be opened, and the dead judged according to what they have done in this world, whether it be good or evil, etc.

The Thirty-nine Articles of Religion of the Church of England, A. D. 1562.

These, held likewise in a revised form by the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, are marked by greater reserve upon this

subject than any of the other creeds. The only reference to it is the following : —

IV. Of the Resurrection of Christ.

Christ did truly rise again from death and took again his body, with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature; wherewith he ascended into heaven, and there sitteth, until he return to judge all men at the last day.

The Anglican Catechism, A. D. 1549,

teaches on this subject simply the Apostles' Creed.

The Heidelberg Catechism, A. D. 1563.

[Of the German Reformed Church of the United States.]

Q. 52 [*upon the Apostles' Creed*]. What comfort is it to thee that Christ shall come again to judge the quick and the dead?

A. That in all my sorrows and persecutions, with uplifted head, I look for the self-same One who has before offered himself for me to the judgment of God, and removed from me all curse, to come again as Judge from heaven; who shall cast all his and my enemies into everlasting condemnation, but shall take me, with all his chosen ones, to himself, into heavenly joy and glory.

Q. 57. What comfort does the resurrection of the body afford thee?

A. That not only my soul, after this life, shall be immediately taken up to Christ its Head, but also that this my body, raised by the power of Christ, shall again be united with my soul, and made like unto the glorious body of Christ.

The Westminster Confession, A. D. 1647.

[Of the Presbyterian churches generally.]

CHAPTER XXXII. OF THE STATE OF MEN AFTER DEATH, AND OF THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD.

I. The bodies of men, after death, return to dust, and see corruption; but their souls (which neither die nor sleep), having an immortal subsistence, immediately return to God who gave them. The souls of the righteous, being then made perfect in holiness, are received into the highest heavens, where they behold the face of God in light and glory, waiting for the full redemption of their bodies; and the souls of the wicked are cast into hell, where they remain in torments and utter darkness, reserved to the judgment of the great day. Besides these two places for souls separated from their bodies, the Scripture acknowledgeth none.

II. At the last day, such as are found alive shall not die, but be changed, and all the dead shall be raised up with the self-same bodies and none other, although with different qualities, which shall be united again to their souls forever.

III. The bodies of the unjust shall, by the power of Christ, be raised to dishonor; the bodies of the just, by his Spirit, unto honor, and be made conformable to his own glorious body.

CHAPTER XXXIII. OF THE LAST JUDGMENT.

I. God hath appointed a day wherein he will judge the world in righteousness by Jesus Christ, to whom all power and judgment is given of the Father. In which day, not only the apostate angels shall be

judged, but likewise all persons that have lived upon earth shall appear before the tribunal of Christ, to give an account of their thoughts, words, and deeds; and to receive according to what they have done in the body, whether good or evil.

II. . . . . Then shall the righteous go into everlasting life, and receive that fullness of joy and refreshing which shall come from the presence of the Lord ; but the wicked, who know not God, and obey not the gospel of Jesus Christ, shall be cast into eternal torments, and be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power.

The Savoy Declaration, A. D. 1658.

[Adopted by the Congregational churches of England.]

Affirms the same as the Westminster, above quoted.

The Boston Confession, A. D. 1680.

[Adopted by the Congregational churches of New England.]

Affirms the same as the Westminster, above quoted.

The Methodist Articles of Religion, A. D. 1784.

These agree on this subject with the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, above quoted, of which Dr. Schaff says that the Methodist Articles "are a liberal and judicious abridgment" of them.

The Declaration of The Congregational Union of England and Wales, A. D. 1833.

XIX. They believe that Christ will finally come to judge the whole human race according to their works; that the bodies of the dead will be raised again; and that, as the Supreme Judge, he will divide the righteous from the wicked, will receive the righteous into "life everlasting," but send away the wicked into "everlasting punishment."

The New Hampshire Baptist Confession, A. D. 1833.

[Widely adopted by Baptists, especially in the Northern and Western States.]

XVIII. Of the World to Come.

We believe that the end of the world is approaching; that at the last day Christ will descend from heaven, and raise the dead from the grave to final retribution; that a solemn separation will then take place; that the wicked will be adjudged to endless punishment and the righteous to endless joy; and that this judgment will fix forever the final state of men in heaven or hell, on principles of righteousness.

Confession of the Free Will Baptists, A. D. 1834, 1868.

Chapter XVIII. Death and the Intermediate State.

1. Death. — As a result of sin, all mankind are subject to the death of the body.

2. The Intermediate State. — The soul does not die with the body; but immediately after death

enters into a conscious state of happiness or misery, according to the moral character here possessed.

CHAPTER XIX. SECOND COMING OF CHRIST.

The Lord Jesus, who ascended on high and sits at the right hand of God, will come again to close the gospel dispensation, glorify his saints, and judge the world.

CHAPTER XX. THE RESURRECTION.

The Scriptures teach the resurrection of the bodies of all men at the last day, each in its own order; they that have done good will come forth to the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil to the resurrection of damnation.

CHAPTER XXI. THE GENERAL JUDGMENT AND FUTURE RETRIBUTIONS.

1. THE GENERAL JUDGMENT. — There will be a general judgment, when time and man's probation will close forever. Then all men will be judged according to their works.

2. FUTURE RETRIBUTIONS. — Immediately after the general judgment the righteous will enter into eternal life, and the wicked will go into a state of endless punishment.

The Declaration of Faith of the National Council of Congregational Churches, Boston, A. D. 1865.

This, after a declaration of adherence "substantially" to the older confessions, *i. e.*, of the Boston Confession and its predecessors, above quoted, goes on to say: —

We believe also in the organized and visible

Church, in the ministry of the Word, in the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, in the resurrection of the body, and in the final judgment, the issues of which are eternal life and everlasting punishment.

Articles of Religion of the Reformed Episcopal Church in America, A. D. 1875.

ART. III. OF THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST AND HIS SECOND COMING.

Christ did truly rise from death, and took again his body with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature, wherewith he ascended into heaven and there sitteth, our High Priest and Advocate, at the right hand of the Father, whence he will return to judge the world in righteousness. This Second Coming is the blessed hope of the Church. The heavens have received him till the times of the restitution of all things. To those who look for him shall he appear a second time without sin unto salvation. Then shall he change the body of our humiliation that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body. He will take to himself his great power, and shall reign till he have put all enemies under his feet.

NOTE B.

ON THE OPINIONS OF THE JEWS CONCERNING THE RESURRECTION.

The Resurrection was a current doctrine of the Jews in the time of Christ, but so presented as to provoke a degree of skepticism, which, in the case

of the Sadducees, went to the length of denying the resurrection utterly. Some of the Rabbis taught a purer doctrine, holding that in the resurrection the just would neither eat, drink, nor marry. But the majority, both of the Rabbis and of the people, held a doctrine extremely gross. The dead were to be raised not only in their former bodies, but even with their bodily appetites and passions. They would eat and drink and marry. The case of the woman with seven husbands, which the Sadducees proposed to Christ, might have been suggested to these skeptics by a case in one of the books, in which it was decided that a woman who had had two husbands would be given to the first. If men were buried in their usual clothes, in these clothes they would rise, and even their bodily blemishes and defects would be perpetuated in the resurrection.

While the extreme grossness of these notions disappeared in the thinking of the Christians, the Jews' general conception of the resurrection passed over into Church teaching, as the writings of many of the Fathers show. Witness such a passage as this in the writings of Augustine:—

"Every body, however dispersed here, shall be restored perfect in the resurrection. Every body shall be complete in quantity and quality. As many hairs as have been shaved off, or nails cut, shall not return in such enormous quantities to deform their original places, but neither shall they perish: they shall return into the body into that substance from which they grew."

Ezekiel's vision of the resurrection of the dry bones in the valley, which he narrates in his 37th

chapter, furnished the original type of this doctrine, around which the later accretions grew in the course of speculation. It was believed that at the coming of the Messiah all Israelites would be gathered from their dispersion throughout the world to the Holy Land, and that the resurrection of the dead would take place thereupon.

Thereupon, also, it was believed that a final judgment would take place in the Valley of Jehoshaphat, as the ravine which separates Jerusalem from the Mount of Olives on the east was called. That valley became in consequence a favorite burial place, as the place where the Messiah, as was believed, would appear to raise the dead preparatory to that final judgment. The last wish of the venerable Rabbi was to be laid there with staff in hand, in readiness for the coming of the Messiah.

Joel's prophecy (iii. 2, 12) of a judgment of "all nations" in the Valley of Jehoshaphat gave rise to these expectations. It is doubtful, however, whether that ravine to the east of Jerusalem bore the name of the Valley of Jehoshaphat in Joel's time. Jehoshaphat signifies "the judgment of Jehovah," and might apply to any valley in which a signal overthrow in battle took place. Some such event was probably the object of Joel's reference.

To match the Jews' belief concerning the appearance of the Messiah in the Valley of Jehoshaphat, the Christians had their generally received belief, that the Mount of Olives, from which Christ ascended, was to be the locality of his second advent, to raise the dead and judge the world.

Whoever will trace the doctrine of the Advent,

the Resurrection, and Final Judgment that prevailed while as yet the Temple stood, will not fail to mark the likeness, at least in general outline, but especially in the whole mechanical way of conceiving the subject, as things externalized to the senses in show and catastrophe, in which these doctrines passed over from the Temple to the Church, to flourish in the Church to this day.

Whether this *Jewish mode of thought* upon the subject has not been the grand mistake which the Church has made in its doctrine of *the Kingdom of Christ* — whether it is not to-day a prodigious anachronism in a period which Christians speak of as "the Dispensation of the Spirit," can by no means be deemed a groundless question.

CHAPTER II.

THE RESURRECTION A CONTINUOUS REALITY.

"I am the Resurrection and the Life." — *John* xi. 25.

THE general subject of the resurrection divides into three main questions: *When* shall it be? *What* shall it be? *How* shall it be? To each of these the words of Christ give clear and sufficient answers. Only one of these questions, however, can be answered at a time. Which, then, shall we take first? If we should first take up the question, *How?* we might find reason in the words of Christ to think that the resurrection is not a miraculous operation from without, but a natural development from within the man.[1] This of itself would go far to show, *when* the resurrection shall be; that it is no long-waiting and far-off event but a continuous reality now manifest in the unseen world. Such, however, has been the predominance of mistaken conceptions, that they will only give way

[1] For this, see chapter ix.

gradually, if they give way at all. For a gradual approach to a true conception, it is better to take the other question first, namely: *When* is the resurrection? We may thus, perhaps, the better extricate ourselves, point by point, from the grasp of false ideas, and gradually prepare the basis of conclusions in which we may intelligently rest.

The answer to the question, *When?* is given in our Lord's answer to Martha in her mourning for Lazarus's death: "I am the Resurrection and the Life."

I. In order to understand an answer, we must know the question to which the answer came. So here. These words of our Lord were spoken in answer to the implied denial of a present resurrection which Martha had just made. As she wept for her dead brother, Christ said, "Thy brother shall rise again." We must not suppose these words to bear a special sense, to refer to the miracle he was about to perform in restoring the brother to the sister. That, strictly speaking, was reanimation, not resurrection.[1] Christ's following utterances show that he was speaking, in a general

[1] See Note B, appended to the next chapter.

way, of the resurrection, as the truth most comforting to any mourner. But to Martha, with her ideas of it, it was poor comfort. She knew that her brother should rise again. But like the Jews of her time, aye, like most Christians now, who inherit their resurrection-doctrine more from the Jews than from Christ, Martha thought only of a grand and general resurrection-day far distant. Long ere that day she would be with her brother in the supposed place of expectant souls, in waiting till the buried body should be raised and given back. "I know," she cried, "that he shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day."

This was equivalent to saying: "Yes, he will rise again, but not till that far-off day shall come. Tell me more and better than that; tell me something I do not know, if you would comfort me now."

To meet this want, to show a consolation stronger than that far-off hope because a reality of the present hour, our Lord replied, "I AM the Resurrection and the Life." Poorly did Martha comprehend it, as the sequel showed, though she sincerely declared her belief in it. Poorly do many other sincere believers to-day comprehend

the comforting significance of this sublime, "I AM." Whoever would comprehend it must start from this fact, that by these words our Lord undertook to comfort a mind, uncomforted by a far-off hope, with the disclosure of a *present* reality. If the reality was not a thing of the present, then it was no better than the far-off hope. But our Lord offers it as evidently better.

II. Two truths are presented in our Lord's words to Martha which demand distinct recognition.

1. The first is that of a *Power*. "I AM" expresses *personality*, and personality is not an event, but a power. The central idea of the resurrection is not that of an occurrence, an event, an effect. It is that of a spiritual *cause*, a vital power. Paul seems to have understood it thus, when he described his own endeavor, "that I may know him, and the power of his resurrection." Our Lord here declares himself to be the personal power which is the efficient cause of what we call the resurrection. Observe, that it is in a derived and secondary sense that we speak of the *effect* of this power as the resurrection. This personal power and the manner of its working will

be understood when we come to study the resurrection as a *development*. (Chap. ix.) Only let it be borne in mind from the first, to avoid misunderstandings, that it is power *working by orderly growth from within the man, not by miraculous operation from without*. Power, spiritual power, is the comprehensive word which sums up Christ's gifts to us: "As many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God." (John i. 12.)

2. The second truth involved in our Lord's words is that his resurrection-power is a power in *present* activity. He did not say, "I shall be," but "I AM." We should never fail to place emphasis on the word AM, in our reading of this passage.

The full significance of this short but pregnant word grows upon us, as soon as we place it in the list to which it belongs, of these sublime self-assertions with which our Lord declared the various relations of his saving power to mankind. In every instance, at least until we come to this, he expresses by the words, "I AM," the *present* activity of that power.

"I am the Light of the world." We know that his light-giving power is operative constantly.

"I am the Good Shepherd." We know that his pastoral care is in exercise to-day.

"I am the Living Bread." We know that he is now the nourisher of believing souls.

"I am the Door." We know that he is now and constantly our means of coming into spiritual life to God.

How is it, then, that any one can doubt him to be the resurrection-power, with the same *present* efficiency, the same *continuity* of action, which we ascribe to him as the Light-giver, the Shepherd, the Food, the Door? How can we deem it any more doubtful that his power raises the departed Christian to-day into the fullness of spiritual life in the spiritual body, than that he to-day enlightens and guides and feeds the Christian in his pilgrimage to "the heavenly country?"

I have no doubt that here we have been misled by a misunderstanding of some other parts of Holy Scripture, — chiefly those which relate to the coming of the Lord, — into a palpable perversion of our Lord's direct testimony. Dominated by prepossessions inherited from the Jews of Christ's time, our minds have been blinded to the

significance of some of his most precious words. And this is the poor result we have come to on the subject of the resurrection: All the other powers which our Lord, by his majestic "I AM," asserts as his present prerogative, we regard as in present and perpetual activity. Not so, however, his resurrection-power. This, though claimed for the present, like all the others, by the same significant "I AM," we conceive of as somehow reserved, suspended, inactive, latent, to be exhibited all at once and explosively, at some "last day" of time, precisely as Martha and other Jews supposed, — precisely as our Lord forbade her to suppose, when he answered her disconsolate ignorance, — "I AM THE RESURRECTION."

We see the other powers claimed by our Lord all in active operation to-day. His resurrection-power, claimed in the same terms as all the rest, is the only one of all which we do not see. Has the exceptional denial of its present and perpetual activity any more valid ground of support than the fact that the sphere of its activity lies beyond our sight?

III. Here, then, is the answer that we must give to the question, *When* is the res-

urrection? If we do not regard our Lord's resurrection-power as somehow outside the circle of the powers which he claims under his peculiar and oft-repeated "I AM," though we can assign no more valid reason for so regarding it than that its activity is hidden from our sight; if we do not feel competent to alter his solemn words, and transform "I AM" into *I shall be*, then must we, in all consistency, believe that he exercises that mysterious power to-day; that he has ever exercised it since he first asserted it, — perhaps also before, as I think we shall find reason to believe;[1] that he will continue to exercise it henceforth as heretofore; that he exercises it, just as he exercises all his powers, according to the eternal laws of spiritual action, that is, according to our endeavor here to prepare the conditions of the resurrection, and our resulting fitness there to experience the resurrection in power and in joy.[2] In other words, and more briefly, men are raised from the dead through the power of Christ, according to their capacity to rise, through their having received that power. This is a fact of *to-day* as really as of any future day.

[1] See chapter viii., Note A.

[2] See chapter iv.

Does this seem to be a great conclusion to build on a little word? Some little words, such as *yes* and *no*, are strong enough to sustain the most extensive conclusions. Such a word as I AM is strong enough to claim for the *present* whatever it is coupled with. Were this all it would be enough to rest on. But it is not all. We shall find, as we go forward with our inquiry, that other material comes in to broaden the base of our conclusion. As we view the subject in other lights, we shall find a brightening assurance that we are on the track of the truth.

IV. With reference to other points to come up hereafter, thus much may be advanced here by way of anticipation.

Whatever notions we may have imbibed to the contrary, the fact will be clear to any careful reader of the Bible that the *simultaneous* resurrection of all the dead, which the creeds teach, is not taught by the Bible. Nay, more than this is true. The Bible explicitly affirms, so that I wonder how it can be thought otherwise, that the resurrection of the dead is not simultaneous; that they do not rise all together, but in a certain succession. Moreover, the Bible teaches that the resurrection, in the Christian sense of

the word, is not a power that operates on all, as the spring sun operates on the leaf-buds, irrespective of personal volition, but a power which, like the wind which the sail is set to catch, must be appropriated by voluntary action in Christian endeavor, *laboring*, like Paul, to "*attain* unto the resurrection of the dead."

From such teachings we shall find, as we advance, that fresh light is shed upon that declaration of our Lord which we have now studied. In every generation of those that are born, through death, into the unseen world, he is not a remote and waiting, but the immediate and active resurrection-power to as many as "hear the voice of the Son of God," to as many as are led by his Spirit, and in fellowship with him. Through "Jesus Christ, the same yesterday and to-day and forever," the invisible world beholds "the spirits of just men made perfect" rising evermore from the dead in the spiritual body, "clothed upon with our house which is from heaven."

V. This truth, when we have grasped it, will give us a more vivid sense of *the relation which Christ holds to us*, as the Lord both of the present and of that veiled future

to which we are advancing. It enforces his great saying (Rev. i. 18), "I hold the keys of death and of the unseen" (*common version*, "hell"). Near as may be the dissolution of our house of clay, so near is our resurrection in the spiritual body. We need not imagine any such thing as that

> —— "that still garden of the souls
> In many a figured leaf enrolls
> The total world since Time began."

We need not think of the departed Christian as in any house of detention, however comfortable, or in a middle state of disembodiment, awaiting a distant day to obtain a body, and with a body the full measure of such life as his relation to Christ capacitates him for. Christ not only IS our *Life*, but he IS also our *Resurrection*. This "IS" is more than a *shall be*. It assures us that immediately beyond the valley of the shadow there rise the hills of light; that One is there, who, if we hear his voice, will take our hand at once, and lead us quickly through the shadow into the light, and up the mount of God in an undelayed progress of power, purity, and peace, in a full experience of "the power of his resurrection."

NOTE A.

ON CHRIST'S ARGUMENT WITH THE SADDUCEES.

And Jesus answering said unto them, The children of this world marry, and are given in marriage:

But they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage:

Neither can they die any more: for they are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection.

Now that the dead are raised, even Moses showed at the bush, when he called the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob.

For he is not a God of the dead, but of the living: for all live unto him. (Luke xx. 34–38.)

There is a marvelous force in this argument, which must be apparent to any one who is at all competent to judge of arguments according to the recognized laws of logic.

Christ is here arguing with Sadducees, who deny that there is any resurrection. (Acts xxiii. 8.) He aims to prove to them "that the dead are raised," or, translating more literally, that the dead *rise*. He deems it sufficient for this, simply to prove, by a quotation from the Old Testament, that the dead *live*. But the living of the dead could prove the rising of the dead only on the assumption that *living* and *rising* are *equivalent terms*.

Moses, says Christ, shows that the dead rise, be-

cause he calls God the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, who died long ago. But since God is not a God of the dead, but the God of the living, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are now living. *Therefore the dead rise.* But this would be no demonstration at all, but a complete *non-sequitur*, except on the assumption that *life after death is life in the resurrection state.* On this assumption only can Christ's reasoning be logically good. If this assumption be made, then, indeed, all that will be necessary, in order to establish the fact of a resurrection, will be to establish the fact of life after death, as Christ does by his quotation.

In the language of logicians, Christ's argument is called an "enthymeme;" a condensed form of reasoning, in which a proposition is tacitly assumed as true, which, if formally stated, would here constitute what is called "the major premiss" of "a syllogism." Drawn out in the full form of a syllogism, this "enthymeme" would stand as follows, the major premiss being assumed as true, and the minor premiss being proved by the quotation: —

Major. Those who live after death live in the resurrection state.

Minor. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob live after death.

Conclusion. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob ["the dead,"] live in the resurrection state.

Supposing that this passage were the only text in the New Testament on the subject of the resurrection, should we conclude the resurrection to be a present reality, or a thing still in the future?

If our main difficulty in accepting this reasoning

as conclusive be the impressions we have derived from certain statements of the Apostles, is it not wise, *first* to let the Master's reasoning make its due impression, — to let Christ teach us how to use the sayings of Paul, rather than let Paul teach us how to use the sayings of Christ. Here let us remember what our Lord himself has said to us : "One is your Master, even Christ." (Matt. xxiii. 8.)

NOTE B.

ON RESURRECTION NOW AND HENCEFORTH.

Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life.

Verily, verily, I say unto you, The hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God : and they that hear shall live.

For as the Father hath life in himself ; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself ;

And hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man.

Marvel not at this : for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice,

And shall come forth ; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation. (John v. 4–29).

The proper interpretation of this passage strongly corroborates the exposition above given of John xi.

25, which, in turn, indisputable by itself, throws light on our Lord's true meaning here.

Three great truths are here announced, namely, (1.) *Spiritual awakening to life now* to all who receive Christ's word in faith ; verse 24. (2.) *Resurrection now and henceforth* to the dead through obedience to his life-giving word ; verse 25. (3.) *Judgment* under Christ extending ultimately over the entire race of man in the world of the resurrection ; verses 28, 29. Upon this outline observe, —

(1.) The emphatic " Verily, verily," which introduces both the 24th and the 25th verses. According to a very common interpretation, verse 25 refers to the *spiritually* dead, to those who are now " dead in trespasses and sins " (Eph. ii. 1), and now awakened by the hearing of the Gospel. If so, then verse 25 is merely a repetition of verse 24. But it is introduced by the " Verily, verily," with which Jesus customarily prefaces a *new* as well as striking thought.

(2.) The passage plainly *emphasizes* the present in verses 24 and 25, and *emphasizes* the future in verses 28 and 29. But, in verse 25, there is a plain *transition* from the present to the future, mention of an hour that is now and is coming, an inclusive emphasis both of the present and the future, a result that is to be now and henceforth. Instead of verse 25 being simply a repetition of what is stated in verse 25 as a present fact, it is an emphatic advance to a new statement. This is marked not only by the solemn asseveration, " Verily, verily," but also by the express revelation of an " hour " which includes both time that is and time that shall be. The spiritual awakening that now is (verse 24) leads on,

both in thought and in fact, to the resurrection that is now and is to be henceforth.

(3.) This conception of our Lord's thought in verse 25, as a marked advance from the doctrine he had just presented of a present spiritual awakening through faith in him, to the doctrine of a present and a coming, that is, a continuous resurrection through the hearing of his voice, is confirmed by the reference of verse 27 to "judgment." Resurrection and judgment are closely united in the New Testament doctrine of the future. Judgment is here spoken of because naturally suggested by the restrictive clause in verse 24, "they that hear shall live." All do not *hear*, therefore all do not *live* (though all exist; "live," here used in a pregnant sense, suggests the difference between mere *being* and *well*-being). Resurrection and judgment, thus coupled in these two verses (25 and 27), are more explicitly set forth together in verse 29, where we must read "resurrection of *judgment*" instead of "resurrection of *damnation*." The original uses the same word in both places (κρίσις — judgment).

(4.) The "marvel not," in verse 28, is to be understood thus: Do not wonder whether I have claimed the power of such judgment as is connected with the resurrection. I do claim it; for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice (for life, as in verse 25, or for the contrary), etc. The omission here of the words, "and now is," which occur in the resurrection doctrine of verse 25, marks a shifting of the thought so as to foretell chiefly the *ultimate extension* of resurrection and judgment over *all mankind*. Not, how-

ever, so as to deny of the present what it affirms of the future.

(5.) Hearing the voice is stated in verse 25 as the means to the resurrection life, but in verse 28 as the means not only to this, but also to judgment upon evil. Consequently it bears a wider sense in the latter verse. Obedient hearing tends to life. But there is also disobedient hearing, tending to judgment. All shall ultimately hear the voice of the Son of God. But while truth accepted is a word of life, truth rejected is a word of judgment. (John xii. 48.) Rejected truth shall ultimately make its judgment voice ring through the spirit that heard and hearkened not. Entering into the future with this judgment voice resounding in conscience *is* "the resurrection of judgment." This, too, is through the voice of the Son of God, as the truth of Christ asserts its judgment power.

(6.) No general, simultaneous event can be supposed intended by "the hour" of verse 28, unless the same can be understood of "the hour" of verse 25, which no interpreter has ever ventured to do.

(7). With regard to the restrictive clause in verse 25, "*they that hear* shall live," we observe that it is precisely similar to the restriction that accompanies every offer of salvation, "*he that believeth* shall be saved." The resurrection of life, as distinct from the resurrection of judgment, is conditioned upon a certain hearing of "the voice of the Son of God." This is not a voice miraculously resounding through space, but a voice making itself heard within the obedient spirit. It is on the obedient relation of the soul to Christ, as the Author of spiritual life through

the receiving of the truth, that the result of *life*, as distinct from existence, depends. How this is we shall see from Paul's doctrine of the resurrection as the object of Christian endeavor. (Chapter iv.)

However the interpretation above given differs from any that we may have adopted, it is certainly the one most consonant with the testimony that is indisputably borne by our Lord's great saying, "I AM the Resurrection and the Life." This fact alone speaks with emphasis in its favor. The harmony of the two speaks for the truth of that view on which the light of both converges. The resurrection is a present and perpetual reality in the world of the unseen, through the power of Christ, through the obedient hearing of the voice of the Son of God.

CHAPTER III.

THE RESURRECTION EXEMPLIFIED IN THE RISEN CHRIST.

"It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body." 1 *Cor.* xv. 44.

I. WHAT is raised? How could the Apostle have used the language above quoted, if *the body that is buried* is not raised, — if at least, as in the case of the seed that is sown, some element of the buried body is not the germ of a body that is to rise from the very grave?

This question betrays two misconceptions.

1. The first of these is a confounding of two things utterly different, the dead *person* and the dead *body*. The dead person is raised; the dead body is not raised. This distinction between the person and his body is clearly recognized by the inquirer, whose question about the *kind* of body to be expected in the resurrection the Apostle is here answering. "*With* what body do

THEY come?" It is a distinction that has been before the world, at least ever since Socrates, in speaking of his own funeral, said to his friends, "You may bury me if you can catch me."

It is true, the analogy of the *seed*, which the Apostle employs for illustration, directly suggests the *survival* in the "spiritual body" of some element that was present in the "natural body." But it is begging the question to assume that this surviving element is *of* the body, as well as *in* it. If Paul was thinking at all (which is uncertain) of an element in the seed that passes over into the new body to which the germinating seed gives place, we can hardly question that he recognized the analogous element that passes from our present body to our future body, as *the spirit*, which is *in* the body but not *of* it. Not to notice such a probability as this were to exhibit an obtuseness like that which Paul rebuked by addressing his questioner as a "simpleton."

But besides this, the notion of a survival and resuscitation of the buried body, or some element of it, involves still another radical misconception, namely: —

2. That *personal identity* requires, at least

so far as some germinant element is concerned, identity of *material* between the body buried and the resurrection-body. But what is it that personal identity depends on? Surely not on the *material* that is organized, but on the *power* that organizes it. I am the same person that I was twenty years ago, simply because my body, though it has changed in every particle twenty times over, is organized and animated by the same *spirit*. People who have not seen me for twenty years do not always know me at first sight as the same, but after a while they recognize my personal identity in its familiar expression. Identity of person and identity of material are very different things. The personal element is the *spirit*. Recognition of identity depends on the expression which the spirit gives to the organism which it animates.

A thought very precious to many sorrowing hearts is touched by the fact just mentioned. It is by no means unlikely that, in the resurrection-state, recognition after long separation may be even more immediate than in this world, conformably to that more perfect power of self-expression which we may attribute to the spirit in the spirit-

ual body. Parents who have seen infant children go before them thither may not expect that their little ones will be always babes, or as babes will meet them again. For life is inseparably connected with growth. But that they will *know* them, perhaps with a more immediate recognition than that with which the mother in the story beholds her long-lost sailor-boy in the weather-beaten wanderer, who knocks for a night's shelter at her door, I cannot doubt, when I reflect that the flesh and blood of the "natural" body, so often a disguise, will be exchanged for a more plastic and perfect organ of self-expression in the "spiritual" body.

As to the recognition of friends in the resurrection-state, it seems plainly taught in the New Testament. Christ said that those who had received charity on earth would welcome their benefactors in heaven. (Luke xvi. 9.) Paul expected to recognize his converts hereafter with rejoicing. (1 Thess. ii. 19.)

The misconception, that personal identity requires the survival and carrying over into the resurrection-body of some element of the mortal body, rests partly on a mistaken no-

tion of the epithets "natural" and "spiritual" which the Apostle applies to the two bodies. It is supposed that these epithets refer to the *material* of which the two bodies are composed. "Spiritual" is supposed to denote a refined or etherealized condition of the material, or a part of the material, which belonged to the "natural" body, and passed over to the new body in the resurrection. Whereas, on the contrary, neither of these terms refer to the *stuff* out of which either body is made, but both refer to the *relation* to its animating principle in which each body exists. The "natural," or, as Paul actually said, the "psychical"[1] body is the body whose life-principle is in the *psyche*, the "living soul" (verse 45), which is common to man and the lower animals — in all essentially a similar assemblage of sentient, appetitive, and intelligent faculties. On the other hand, the "spiritual" body is the body whose life-principle is in the *pneuma*, the "spirit," which is peculiar to man. Instead, therefore, of referring to some highly sublimated material,

[1] For other texts where this word occurs, compare 1 Cor. ii. 14, and Jude 19, where it is translated "sensual." See, also, Genesis i. 24, and ii. 7, where "living creature" and "living soul" stand for the same original.

which, in ignorance of its nature, may be called "spirit," the epithet "spiritual" denotes the resurrection-body not as a body formed *out of* spirit, but rather formed *for* the spirit — perhaps we may find cause to say, formed *by* the spirit, the plastic organ of its self-expression, the obedient instrument of its will.

What is raised then? Can we any longer use with propriety the venerable phrase of the Apostles' Creed, "I believe in the resurrection of the body," if the buried body has no part in the resurrection?

We may on one condition still properly use this time-hallowed phrase — remembering, however, that it comes to us from outside of the New Testament, which speaks of "the resurrection of the *dead*," not of the dead *body*. We may intelligently class it with those numerous phrases which are understood to speak *the language of appearance*, not the language of reality.

We visit the grave of a friend. We point to the mound, and say, "He lies there." No, *he* does not; it only appears as though he did. The body in which he always appeared to us lies below the ground, and a sign of it appears in the hillock of turf

above it. Common speech is full of this language of appearance. We sail out to sea, and say, "The land sinks below the horizon." That is, it appears to sink. In reality, the curvature of the earth intervenes, and hides the land from our view. So we say, "The sun rises." He appears to rise, but really the earth rolls round and brings him into view. The same law of language justifies us in speaking of "the resurrection of the body," provided we use it intelligently as the language of *appearance* only. A body has disappeared in the grave; "the earthly house of this tabernacle is dissolved." Instead of it another body appears, "a building of God," "eternal in the heavens." It belongs to the same person, and is recognizable as his. Though the change is the substitution of an entirely different body, the appearance is as if the body that was put into the grave had been raised out of the grave. Yet it is significant, that the Bible, elsewhere using so much of the language of appearance, should strictly avoid it here, and speak only of "the resurrection of the *dead*," as if to keep us out of the Jewish way of thinking about the resurrection of the *body*.

The popular belief on this subject, in Christ's time, was such as to provoke the skepticism of the Sadducees. Even bodily blemishes and defects were to reappear in the resurrection-body, so that personal identity might be recognized. The same way of thinking continues. It is not long since some improvement in the city of Marseilles made it desirable to remove part of the Jews' burying-ground. The authorities promised the greatest care in the removal of the bones to another spot. But the Jews still feared that portions of different bodies might be mixed or lost. They accordingly refused consent on the ground that it would "embarrass the resurrection!"

The notion of the actual resurrection of the buried body, or any particle of it, is indeed so "embarrassed" by such difficulties in the way of rational and Christian thought, that it is no longer supported by any reason, except the very vague and inappropriate one, that God can do anything.

When we consider the fugitive nature of the elements which compose our bodies, it seems unlikely that there is a particle of dust on the planet to which any human

being can lay an exclusive claim. Knowing what scientific men now tell us, that the particles of our bodies are entirely dissipated and replaced by fresh ones in the course of every year that we live, how inconceivable it is to suppose that such particles as happen to compose our bodies at the particular moment of death will, somehow, at least some of them, be fixed and secured to the individual for resumption ages hence in the resurrection! Granting that God *could*, what shadow of reason for supposing that God *will?* If my body today is an entirely different body, so far as every component particle is concerned, from what it was a year ago, how much more may I expect the resurrection-body to be entirely different from that which is surrendered to the grave! *I* shall be raised. My body will not be raised. Yet none the less shall I be raised in *a body;* — I shall rise in the "spiritual body."

II. A solitary but glorious illustration of the difference between the "natural" and the "spiritual body" is given in the resurrection of Christ. The study of this may somewhat further free the subject from mis-

conception. The resurrection of Christ is presented in the New Testament as both the pledge and the pattern of our own. "If we believe that Jesus died and rose again, *even so* them also which sleep," etc. (1 Thess. iv. 14.) From this the inference is drawn that, as Jesus rose in the same body that was "crucified, dead, and buried," *even so* shall our resurrection be, as the creeds say, in "the self-same bodies and no other." But the question interposes: Would not our resurrection be *essentially* like that of Christ, if it did not go to the length of material identity between the body buried and the body raised? If Christ rose in the spiritual body, if we rise in the spiritual body, the parallel is complete. The parallel does not lie in the *stuff* of which the resurrection-body is organized, but in the *power* that organizes it, and the *relation* in which that body exists to the organizing power, the spirit. The Apostle says, "He shall change our vile[1] (properly, our *humble*) body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body." (Phil. iii. 21.) The promise is ful-

[1] Archbishop Trench properly characterizes this mistranslation as a relic of the monastic and ascetic mode of thought, which disparaged the body as a polluted thing.

filled, and the parallel sustained, though this change involve the substitution of a *new* body, having, in itself, nothing in common with the body of flesh and blood.

Now, as to Christ's resurrection, he had coupled with his sublime claim to be the Divine Saviour of the world the declaration that he would rise from the dead on the third day. There was a moral necessity that this should be so fulfilled that no unbeliever could say to those who proclaimed the resurrection of the crucified one, "We have the crucified body in our hands still, and you have been deceived by a ghost." This would have been said, if it could have been said, but it never could be said. The crucified body had disappeared.

The facts of the reappearance of the Lord to his disciples are on record, to show that his body after resurrection manifested new and surprising powers; it was able to appear and vanish in closed apartments; it was able to change its expression, so as to prevent recognition by acquaintances; it was able to rise into the clouds of heaven till it disappeared. The record obliges us to conclude: —

(1.) It could not have been *no* body,

since it was handled, and ate food, to demonstrate that it was a body.

(2.) It was, in some respects, the *same* body that had been crucified, since it carried the wounds of the cross, and permitted them to be examined by the touch, while at the same time, the crucified body had disappeared from its keepers.

(3.) It was, in some respects, a *changed* body, for it manifested powers which it had never before manifested. "It is palpable, not only as a whole, but also in its different parts: — raised above space, so that it can in a much shorter time than we transport itself from one locality to another; gifted with the capability, in subjection to a mightier will, of becoming sometimes visible, sometimes invisible. It bears the unmistakable traces of its former condition, but is, at the same time, raised above the confining limitations of this. It is in a word a *spiritual* body, no longer subject to the flesh, but filled, guided, borne by the spirit, and yet none the less a *body*. It *can* eat, but it no longer *needs* to eat; it can reveal itself in one place, but is not bound to this one place; it can show itself within the

sphere of this world, but is not limited to this sphere." [1]

Such was the change that passed upon our Lord's body in the resurrection. By this we are to measure the import of the Apostolic doctrine of the "spiritual" body, and the import of the teaching that his resurrection is representative of ours. The great change we anticipate nowise affects the mortal body; *that* has vanished utterly and forever. It exhibits the living spirit "clothed upon" with another body, a body that is subjected to the power of the spirit as the body of flesh and blood is not. The risen Christ undoubtedly manifested himself in a body that was raised above the limitations of flesh and blood, raised above subjection to the physical laws that assert supremacy over our bodies; a "spiritual" body, because thoroughly responsive to the will of the spirit; a "glorious" body, because capable of emitting the glory of the inhabiting spirit, even as John at Patmos saw its face like "the face of the sun shining in his strength." (Rev. i. 16.) In this, we are to see illustrated what the Apostle says of our resurrection: "It is raised a spiritual

[1] Van Oosterzee.

body," capable, through its relation to the organizing and controlling spirit, of manifesting, like a glass, what we *are*, in the glory or the vileness of character; capable also of doing — I do not say what we will, but — what we are *able* to will.

Here we must pass to another point of view. Some hints that have been dropped in this chapter will be taken up and expanded in another connection.

NOTE A.

THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST NOT COMPLETELY MANIFESTED TILL HIS ASCENSION.

And when she had thus said, she turned herself back, and saw Jesus standing, and knew not that it was Jesus.

Jesus saith unto her, Woman, why weepest thou? whom seekest thou? She, supposing him to be the gardener, saith unto him, Sir, if thou have borne him hence, tell me where thou hast laid him, and I will take him away.

Jesus saith unto her, Mary. She turned herself, and saith unto him, Rabboni; which is to say, Master.

Jesus saith unto her, Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father: but go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and *to* my God, and your God. (John xx. 14–17.)

We are not to suppose, from verses 14 and 15, that Jesus had so changed his former expression that Mary, so familiar as she was with his personal appearance, supposed, *on a direct look*, that he was the gardener. I suppose that her turning, in verse 14, was a partial turning, just enough to observe the *presence*, not the appearance, of the person behind her. Eyes dimmed with tears, and a preoccupied mind, together with this half turning, are quite enough to account for her impression that he was "the gardener." But when she heard her name uttered in the familiar tone, "*Mary*," "she turned herself" *fully round* to see the speaker, and then the illusion vanished in an immediate recognition: "My Master!"

But Jesus drew back from the touch with which she seems to have sought to verify the reality of which her eyes assured her. Here we come to the main point of interest in this passage. Why Jesus should have refused *to her* the touch to which he invited others, is commonly explained by saying that touch was necessary to convince others that he was really in the body, but not necessary to convince her. This is apparently intimated in what Jesus says, but more than this is intimated. Jesus manifests an unwonted reserve. His reserve seems to intimate not only the needlessness of the verifying touch for her, but also that there is to be more of a change in him than is yet apparent. "Touch me not," he says, "for I am not yet ascended. [The perfect tense is used in the original, 'I have not yet ascended.'] I am still, as you believe, in the familiar body of 'flesh and bones' (Luke xxiv. 39), which

you do not need to touch. I am not yet in the fully glorified ascension-body, which, if you could, you might need to test by touch. But this flesh and bone does not inherit the kingdom of God (1 Cor. xv. 50); it does not pass into the heavens. Go, therefore, to my brethren and say unto them, 'I ascend [or, "I am ascending"]; I change; through the power of my spirit I am passing into my ascension-state, to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God.'"

To such a body as our Lord manifested to his disciples on his resurrection-day, plastic to the quickening power of his spirit, a change, even of substance and of organization, and an ascension to heaven, seems as natural as anything could be. His resurrection and his ascension are rightly viewed as *the beginning and the end of one process of change*, and this process we call his glorification, as the Apostles call it. (John xii. 16.) These two were separated from each other by that interval of "forty days" for his disciples' sake. It was necessary for them to meet him at intervals to perfect their conviction of his resurrection, and to receive the indispensable last instructions and commands. It is noticeable that of the ten meetings with one or more of the disciples, which we have record of, *five* occurred on the resurrection-day; but during the remaining time Jesus seems to have remained for the most part invisible. The change which transfigured the body that had been lifted up upon the cross into the body that was taken up behind the cloud certainly began on the resurrection-day, and was not completely manifest till the ascension-day. Between the two days it

may have had, as Müller thinks, "a progressive development." This seems to be suggested by our Lord's mysterious saying to Mary. Nevertheless, it seems impossible to doubt that he has given us, in the interviews granted to the witnesses of his resurrection, an illustration that goes as far as we are yet capable of going toward the glorious truth which the Apostle has expressed in saying, "It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body."

NOTE B.

ON RESURRECTION AS DISTINCT FROM REANIMATION.

But now is Christ risen from the dead, *and* become the first-fruits of them that slept. (1 Cor. xv. 20.)

Before the resurrection of Christ there had been other instances of what is popularly termed "resurrection," as in the case of Lazarus and others whom Christ raised from the dead. In the Old Testament period, also, there had been similar cases, as in the history of Elijah and Elisha. Had the resurrection of Christ been like these earlier resurrections, as we call them, simply the return of the spirit to the waiting body, and a mere reviving and continuance of the interrupted life, it is hard to see truth in the terms frequently applied to Christ as "the first born from the dead" (Col. i. 18), "the first begotten of the dead" (Rev. i. 5), "the first-fruits" (1 Cor. xv. 20, 23). We recognize the appropriateness of such terms to Christ only when we perceive that his reappearance within the circle of the friends who had

buried him was not on a level with that of Lazarus, but in a higher mode of life than that which he had quitted. In Lazarus we behold simply the *reanimation* of the "natural body," and the resumption of the fleshly life. In Christ we behold *resurrection* in the spiritual body, and assumption of the life of the world to come. This is fully demonstrated by the facts given in the gospel record, and this is *required* by the exceptional preëminence which the New Testament accords to Christ's rising from the dead. But one instance of veritable *resurrection* has been vouchsafed to our knowledge, as a sure pledge of that which is to come. This is manifest in the risen Christ, who thereby "was declared to be the Son of God with power." (Rom. i. 4.) All the partial resemblances to this which are found on record are cases of mere *resuscitation* or reanimation.

NOTE C.

ON THE RESURRECTION OF THE JEWISH SAINTS.

And, behold, the vail of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom; and the earth did quake, and the rocks rent;

And the graves were opened; and many bodies of the saints which slept arose,

And came out of the graves after his resurrection, and went into the holy city, and appeared unto many. (Matt. xxvii. 51–53.)

[As to the question about the genuineness of this passage see below.]

I. This passage states a notable fact in the following particulars, namely: —

(1.) An earthquake at the crucifixion rent the tombs cut in the rocky hill-sides.

(2.) Many bodies of holy persons who had died arose.

(3.) This was evidenced by their appearing to many after they had gone forth from their tombs.

(4.) This quitting of the tombs and appearing to witnesses took place after Christ had quitted his tomb.

II. Upon this we have to observe :—

(1.) The *language* is evidently that of a narrator who believes in the resurrection of the dead in the self-same body that died and was buried. This was the uniform belief of all Jews.

(2.) The *fact* conveyed by the language is the appearance of the departed saints in the spiritual body, the body of the resurrection-state.

(3.) The explanatory *parallel* to this fact is found in the appearance of Moses and Elijah upon the Mount of Transfiguration in the spiritual body. The two events are of the same kind. A glorious event in the history of our Saviour gave occasion for each. One was as appropriate as the other to the event in Christ's history with which it was associated.

For the question, whether the resurrection of these Jewish saints (as distinct from the *manifestation* of it to witnesses) took place first at Christ's resurrection, or before, whenever their death took place, refer to chapter viii.

Upon the necessity of discriminating, in this and many other passages, between the *fact* testified to and the narrator's *opinions* about the fact, as apparent in his language, refer to chapter viii.

The foregoing remarks assume the genuineness of the statement as from Matthew. If genuine, it must be so explained. It is not impossible, however, that the story may have been interpolated into the Gospel from the so-called "Acts of Pilate," a document existing as early as A. D. 150, and professing to give a report of Jesus' trial and execution. See Huidekoper's "Indirect Testimony to the Gospels."

NOTE D.

WHERE WAS CHRIST BETWEEN HIS DEATH AND RESURRECTION?

And Jesus said unto him, Verily I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise. (Luke xxiii. 43.)

The Apostles' Creed, as early as A. D. 390, admitted the clause which in the English version reads, "He descended into hell," the original of which, *Descendit in Inferna*, signifies "He went down into the lower world," that is, the world of the dead and buried. This seems to have been based on the statement in 1 Peter iii. 18–20:—

For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit:

By which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison;

Which sometimes were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah,

while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls, were saved by water.

Many orthodox Protestants have denied the plain and obvious sense of these words, namely, that Christ preached *the gospel* to the sinners who perished in the flood, contending that Peter here refers to the preaching of Noah to those sinners, before the flood, through the Spirit of Christ which was in him. Such an interpretation is evidently a dogmatic *twist*, intended to rescue Peter's statement from the hands of any who might be disposed to extract from it a hope that gospel offers may be made beyond the grave.

Some "orthodox" theologians have taught that Christ after his death went to hell and suffered the torments of the damned. Others, shrinking from so revolting a conception, made in deference to the supposed exigencies of a special theory of the Atonement, have held that Christ went from the cross back to the heaven from which he came, and there remained till the hour of his resurrection. Our Lord himself speaks of "Paradise" as the abode awaiting him and the penitent thief together. "Today thou shalt be with me in Paradise." Spoken, as this was, to a man possessed of only the most rudimentary notions of the future state, according to the popular ideas of the time, it must be understood, accordingly, as communicating only what the hearer could comprehend. Paradise, as the Jews conceived it, was the part of the underworld appropriated to the blessed, as Gehenna was the part reserved for the tormented. From the Cross to Para-

dise was a transition from pain to peace and from distress to comfort. Nothing more definite than this is conveyed by our Lord's promise to his fellow-sufferer. All that the New Testament has to say more definitely of Christ's place or occupation during those three days is said in the passage quoted from Peter.

"The natural unforced interpretation of this text," says the late Professor Hadley, of Yale College, "is this, that Christ preached, that is made the announcements and offers of the gospel, to departed spirits who were in confinement as a consequence of their disbelief and abuse of the Divine forbearance during the days of Noah. This meaning I should not dare to discard."[1] That this preaching of Christ took place after his death is the natural implication, but not the express assertion, of Peter's language. However many and important questions this leaves waiting for answer, it is all that is told us. Anything beyond this is mere inference and speculation.

But wherever Christ was, and whatever Christ did, during that mysterious interval, we can hardly doubt that when he went forth from the crucified body he went into no disembodied condition, but rather into a spiritual body, appropriate to the world into which "he went and preached to the spirits in prison." As on entering our present world he took on him our "natural body," appropriate to this world, so on his entering the world of "the spirits in prison" we must think of him as taking

[1] See further in my essay, *Is Eternal Punishment Endless?* pp. 86–88.

on a "spiritual body," appropriate to the world of spirits. We think of him as passing at will from one habitation or "tabernacle" to another, and that in each direction. This entrance into the spiritual body of the invisible world was *actual* resurrection, but not manifested resurrection. His resurrection was not to be made *manifest* to the chosen witnesses till "his hour" had come, upon the Lord's Day.

NOTE E.

MORTAL BODIES QUICKENED.

And if Christ *be* in you, the body *is* dead because of sin; but the spirit *is* life because of righteousness.

But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you.

Therefore, brethren, we are debtors, not to the flesh, to live after the flesh.

For if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die; but if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live.

For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God. (Rom. viii. 10–14.)

The analogy, drawn in this passage from the resurrection of Christ to the quickening of our mortal bodies, is thought to give some color to the notion of the raising up of "the self-same bodies that were buried."

Whether this "physical resurrection" was in Paul's thought we must determine: —

(1.) From the *limitations* which other sayings of the Apostle require us to assign to his meaning here. The whole drift of his argument in 1 Cor. xv. is to the *otherness* of the future body. So, in 2 Cor. v., when the earthly is "*dissolved*" we straightway "***have***" the heavenly.

(2.) From the point of his *conclusion*, verse 12. *Therefore*, ye are now obligated to a spiritual life. No more is to be demanded in the premises than this "therefore" requires. We are not to travel outside of the range of the argument. All that is required as a ground on which to base the obligation to a spiritual life now is the *ability* to lead such a life, and this flows from a quickening *power* residing within the mortal body.

(3.) From the whole *drift* of his argument. In chapter vi. 4–11, the Apostle has already drawn an analogy between the resurrection-life of Christ and the new spiritual life of the Christian in the present world. Returning to this in the present chapter, he shows that the *seat* of this life is in the spirit (spelled with a small *s*) not the body, the *source* of it in the Divine Spirit, and the *channel* through which the quickening power flows from God to man is righteousness. He reasons thus: —

"The body is dead because of sin." Not that death, as a physical experience, has been inflicted on the body by sin in the way of penalty. Death, in Paul's view, is a spiritual effect, due to sin as the corresponding spiritual cause.[1] In the body, apart

[1] The decisive but not the only text for this view is Rom. vi. 23, as the contrast between "death" and "eternal life" requires.

from the spirit, is merely animal life, not spiritual. As devoid of spiritual life, the body is dead, and remains dead, because of sin, since sin excludes the Spirit of righteousness, the quickening power. "If Christ be in you, the body is (thus) dead" only in so far as sin, the excluder of spiritual life, is tolerated. Also, "if Christ be in you, the spirit is life because of righteousness," so far as you are intent on righteousness, which allies it with the Supreme Life-Giver, and keeps an open channel between the Divine Fountain and the human vessel.

"*And* (not 'but,' but *And so*) if the Spirit of him that raised up the human Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up the divine Christ[1] from the dead shall also (or even) impart the life of the spirit to your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you." And this, *now;* "so that ye are not debtors to the flesh," not constrained by your existence in these bodies to live in sin, "after the flesh." The life of the spirit shall so control and quicken your mortal bodies that they shall not be a "dead" weight upon your spiritual life, but "as instruments of righteousness" (chap. vi. 13), shall subserve and further it.

THEREFORE (so runs the conclusion), this mortal body is no excuse (see, especially, chap. vii. 23–25) for supineness as regards the struggles of spiritual life, for it shall be quickened by that life so far as we yield ourselves in righteousness to the life-giving Spirit of God.

[1] Observe the significant transition from the term "Jesus," appropriate to the physical life, to the term "Christ," appropriate to the spiritual.

NOTE F.

THE REDEMPTION OF OUR BODY.

Waiting for the adoption, *to wit*, the redemption of our body. (Rom. viii. 23.)

Here, as in the passage examined in Note E, the question is not what these words are capable of meaning *as words*, but what they must mean in connection with the circle of ideas in which they stand, and what significance is cast upon them by other parts of the Apostle's teaching, as 1 Cor. xv., and 2 Cor. v.

We must weigh this expression, "the redemption of our body," by the fact that the Pauline terms, "natural body" and "spiritual body," have their distinction, not in the *substance* out of which each body is organized, but in the organizing, animating, and controlling *power* in each. (See p. 60.) This is the animal soul (*psyche*) in the "natural" (psychic) body that now is, but the spirit (*pneuma*) in the "spiritual" (pneumatic) body that shall be. The distinction is not material, but dynamical; not in the *stuff*, but in the *power*.

Conformably to this distinction, the redemption of our body is not the transference of the *body* from the grave to the sky, or of the same body from the grosser *organization* of flesh and blood to the ethereal *organization* of "spirit." The Apostle thinks of us as always having a body, of the one sort or the other, never as "unclothed" or "naked" (2 Cor. v. 3, 4), but always able to say, with the fullest

sense of possession, "*our* body." He accordingly regards its "redemption" as the transfer of the *power* which animates and controls "our body" from the lower life principle to the higher, from the psyche ("soul") to the pneuma ("spirit"). This is as far as can be from implying any "redemption" of the buried dust, or any portion of it, from the realm of dead matter.

It is true, indeed, that the phraseology is precisely such as any Jewish Rabbi of that time might have used, with his notions of the resurrection as the *re-animation* of the buried body, with all its "natural" parts, passions, blemishes, and even its clothes. But those notions and Paul's thoughts are diametrically opposite. All Paul's reasoning shows that, in the spiritual life of his thought, that materialistic phrase itself has passed through a resurrection from the realm of flesh to that of spirit.

"The adoption" we wait for, as "the children of God, led by the Spirit of God" (verse 14), will be consummated, when "our body" is manifested, in "the resurrection of life," as no more the "natural body," in the power of the animal life, or "soul," but as the "spiritual body," in the full power of the spirit, which builds it, controls it, glorifies it. This resurrection is *as if* the "natural body" had been raised and redeemed, but not *because* of any such thing. "The earthly is *dissolved;* we *have* the heavenly," as exemplified in the Risen Christ, "who," says Paul, "shall change our humble body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself." (Phil. iii. 21.)

CHAPTER IV.

THE RESURRECTION AN OBJECT OF CHRISTIAN ENDEAVOR, ATTAINED AT DEATH.

"They who shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world and the resurrection from the dead." — *Luke* xx. 35.

WHAT clear idea do the majority of Bible readers get from these words of our Lord? Do they not deserve an effort to understand them better?

The resurrection, we have been taught to believe, is an *event*, and an event which, like the sunrise, the regular course of events will bring at once to all. It is regarded as the awaking of all together to judgment together; the morning call of the Great and Last Day. Thus almost all Christians hold the traditional belief. But here our Lord speaks of some men, not all men, as "accounted worthy to obtain the resurrection." The resurrection, then, is a thing which depends on worthiness. Those who are not "accounted worthy to obtain" it do not obtain it. No other inference can possibly be drawn from these words.

And yet our Lord has taught, with no less explicitness, that "all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good unto a resurrection of life, and they that have done evil unto a resurrection of judgment." (John v. 29.)

Comparing these passages, it would seem that the resurrection to be obtained by worthiness is the resurrection of life.

The same thought is obtained by comparing two utterances of the Apostle Paul. Writing to the Philippians (iii. 11), he speaks of his *endeavor* to be accounted worthy of the resurrection: "if by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead." Now unless striving and not striving are the same thing, the results of striving and not striving cannot be the same thing. The resurrrection that Paul strives for cannot be attained by all together with Paul, because there are many who do not strive with Paul.

And yet Paul declares, with equal explicitness, that *all* shall rise from the dead. Speaking before Felix, he says: "I have hope toward God . . . . that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust." (Acts xxiv. 15.)

I. The only conclusion from these identical teachings of the Master and his disciple is this: All rise; not all alike. *The* resurrection, in the full and ideal sense, "of life," is attained by Christian endeavor only. *A* resurrection, unlike, inferior, "of judgment," awaits "the unjust," and all who do not put forth Christian endeavor. It is what mere neglected nature brings to pass, without endeavor.

(1.) Observe that this conclusion throws clearer light upon our Lord's great saying: "I AM the Resurrection and the Life." He by whose Spirit the endeavor is inspired and guided, and the result attained, may fitly claim to be the personal representation of the resurrection power. (See p. 41.)

(2.) Observe, also, that this shows the same distinction in the New Testament use of the word "resurrection" that we make in our common use of the word "life." We know and say that there is life which is not *life*. We simply carry into the future our common distinction between life in the *bare* sense and life in the *full* sense, between being and *well*-being, when we think of the rising of Paul as *the* resurrection, that of Judas as simply resurrection. We speak

out of an intelligence both profound and clear, when we say of multitudes in this world, "not all who live *live*." What is the life of "a tramp?" He is alive, but does not his existence seem to us more like death and hell than *life?* Thus our common speech recognizes, in many words, a physical or natural meaning and a spiritual one, a skeleton-like meaning, bare as fleshless bones of all that constitutes ideal life, and a vitalized meaning, complete as a perfect body in all the attributes that can pertain to perfection of life. Resurrection is one of these words of double meaning. It may denote a life condition of fullness and power, or a life condition of defect and weakness. Thus only can we consistently interpret the teachings both of Christ and of Paul.

(3.) But in what direction do these teachings plainly lead? Do they not plainly contemplate the resurrection not as an external *event*, but as a spiritual *condition*, resulting from spiritual processes?

Another thing is also plainly recognized. After speaking of his endeavor to "attain unto the resurrection of the dead," Paul goes right on to say, "Not as though I had

already attained, either were already perfect, but I follow after, if that I may lay hold of that for which also I was laid hold of by Christ Jesus." That is, in Paul's view, the attainment of the resurrection is a *present* concern. It must be worked out here. It cannot be laid over till the future state begins. The result which Paul deems it necessary to attain before he dies is a certain spiritual condition. This, *potentially*, is the resurrection. It involves it as the bud involves the flower.

Certainly, this way of thinking is not in the line of the traditional expectation of a world-wide, external event, to burst upon all mankind simultaneously, ages hence.

II. We are now introduced to the question: *When* did Paul expect the bud to unfold and the flower to appear? *When* did he expect to realize that he had attained the resurrection fully?

The conclusion has been already drawn (chapter i.) from our Lord's great saying: "I am the Resurrection and the Life," that his resurrection-power, like every other power which he claims in that frequent assertion, "I AM," is a power in present and perpetual exercise; that through this

power the unseen world beholds "the spirits of just men made perfect" perpetually rising from the dead in the spiritual body, in the completeness of the "resurrection of life."

Further evidence for this is now to come before us from the Scriptures.

(1.) That this, at least in some, or many, cases, is not to be delayed till that universal and simultaneous awakening which the popular tradition anticipates, appears from what John tells us of what he calls "the First Resurrection" (Rev. xx. 5, 6), in which "blessed and holy" spirits participate, and enjoy a period of glory for "a thousand years," during which, he says, "the rest of the dead lived not again." However we explain the particulars of this prophecy (of which due account will be made in chapter ix. and notes), the general fact on the face of it is, that some of the dead will have their resurrection before others. But let the fact here be noted, to be thought on, that except among a limited number of Christians, who hold what are called "peculiar views," the doctrine of the first resurrection has been dropped out of mind, as an insoluble enigma. It need not,

it ought not, to be dropped. We can find its place in finding a more rational and scriptural view of the whole subject to which it belongs.

(2.) Further testimony comes from Paul. He tells the Corinthians (1, xv. 22) that as death comes to all from Adam, so resurrection comes to all from Christ: "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." "But," he immediately adds, "every man in his own order" (τάγμα, a division, like that of an army). What clearer way of saying "not all at once"? This is the natural sense given by the connection of ideas in the parallel between Adam and Christ. All are not born of Adam at once, nor do all born of Adam die at once. They are born and die in their generations, every man in his own generation or "order." So of that birth into the future body which we name the resurrection, what more congruous with the Apostle's way of speaking than that it is in the successive *generations*, "every man in his own"?[1]

(3.) Perhaps plainer still is what Paul

[1] See, upon this passage, Note C, appended to the next chapter.

says in his second letter to the Corinthians (v. 1): "We know that, if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, *we have* a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." Paul is here speaking, not merely of the present and the future *state*, but of the present and the future *body* — being "unclothed" of the one and "clothed upon" with the other. If, however, the traditional notions of the subject are true, Paul does not now *have* this anticipated "house," or body, but only a prospect of having it by and by. But he does not say, we *shall* have it, but, *we have it.* He plainly thinks, that we have it when we cease to have the earthly body. He expects to move directly from the one "house" into the other. "If the earthly be dissolved, *we have*[1] the heavenly." Then he goes on to develop his thought. He regards death as not merely an *un*clothing, a *dis*embodiment of the spirit, but a clothing upon, a reëmbodiment, an accession of life more abundant. "For we that are in this tabernacle do groan being burdened, not for

[1] Compare with this the similar emphatic assertion which Paul makes that the spiritual body of the resurrection is a present reality, "There *is* a spiritual body." (1 Cor. xv. 44.)

that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life." But how could mortality be thus "swallowed up" — every trace of it obliterated — if such a trace of it remained as a naked, disembodied spirit, *in waiting* for a new body, still carrying unsatisfied the longings of mortality which Paul expressed in his "earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven"? Paul expressly intimates his hope of the contrary, though not so clearly in the English version as in the original. He uses a phrase by which the Greek denotes a supposition as taken for granted, and says: "*since*[1] (English, *if so be that*) being clothed [as I anticipate] we shall not be found naked," or without a body.

(4.) In close connection with what Paul says of the earthly and the heavenly house, or body, may be put what Christ said to the covetous (Luke xvi. 9), urging them to beneficence, "that when riches fail you[2] [at death] they [your beneficiaries] may wel-

[1] Robinson's *Lex.*, p. 139, translates εἴ γε καί, etc. "*if indeed also* [as we may take for granted, that is, since] *being clothed we shall not be found naked.*"

[2] This is now the accepted reading of the passage, "that when *it* [mammon] fails."

come you into the everlasting habitations." The word for "habitation" is identical in meaning, and nearly so in form, with the word by which Paul denotes the earthly body (σκήνη σκῆνος, *tabernacle* or *tent*). And the welcoming into the heavenly "tents" Christ puts *at the time when* the earthly ones cease to be.

All these testimonies of Holy Scripture, with others that might be put beside them, did not these seem abundantly adequate, converge upon the point of truth which our Lord's great saying illuminates. We cannot reasonably doubt that his resurrection-power, like all his other powers, is claimed as a present activity, though behind the veil, by his decisive "I AM." It operates, like all his other powers, to-day and perpetually, though beyond our sight. To as many as have by Christian endeavor prepared the Christly conditions of being "accounted worthy to obtain the resurrection," he is to-day the author of the resurrection of life in the spiritual body, as really as he is to-day the author of the preparatory work of divine grace within our souls.

III. This conclusive testimony of Holy Scripture to the present and continuous ac-

complishment of the resurrection, "every man in his own order," is reënforced by other considerations.

(1.) Reflecting minds must draw an inference upon this subject from what they see of *the principle of continuity* that is apparent in all the works of God. We see no general arrest of progress anywhere. The testimony of the past ages is uniform. The earth, life, man, civilization, religion, every thing in which physical, social, spiritual forces work, exhibits continuous movement forward, without arrest or halt. God is perpetually active in all his works (John v. 17), pouring into them life ever more abundantly. Directly opposed, in principle, to all this, as well as wholly unsupported by the teaching of our Lord, is the old notion that has come down from the Jews into our modern churches, of an "intermediate," and privative, state of existence, in which the souls of the dead halt and wait, in a long interruption of embodied conditions, until a day arrives that clothes them again with the bodies they have waited for, and finally sets them forward completely equipped for the heavenly existence.

(2.) Since we must regard the principle

of continuity, elsewhere observable, as operative likewise in the invisible world, we cannot accept the notion that death introduces in any respect a *subsidence* into lower, or negative, privative or less perfect conditions, like what Paul terms "nakedness" or disembodiment.[1] Here we must cut wholly loose from Old Testament doctrine, and turn our backs on all those quotations from the Hebrew writers, which may be adduced in plenty to sustain the notion we must discard. "The dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down into silence."

[1] The "Larger Catechism" of the Presbyterian Church (U. S.) strives hard to look in the other direction. It affirms that the souls of the righteous, "immediately after death," "are made perfect in holiness, and received into the highest heavens, where they behold the face of God in light and glory, waiting for the full redemption of their bodies, which even in death continue united to Christ, and rest in their graves as in their beds, till at the last day they be again united to their souls." (§ 86.)

Nevertheless, these souls are conceived of as disembodied, or, in Paul's phrase, "naked." And how can this be anything but a *privative* condition, destitute of the necessary organ for the manifestation of life in its normal completeness, in the union of body and spirit. Such an intermediate life is, so far, a mutilated one, in which death is not "swallowed up," but rather maintains a perpetual trophy of victory, in the "naked" state of the spirit.

Evidently, there is such a thing as "orthodox" transcendentalism. The above is a fair specimen, especially in its view of the dissolved body as still "united to Christ."

(Psalm cxv. 17.) We must meet all such statements with the fact that "life and immortality have been brought to light by the gospel" — by the gospel of the resurrection.[1]

Death cannot be a *descent* into a less complete, less highly developed, state of being than the present. It must be *ascent*, rather, into a state of greater completeness, higher development, capacitated for more exalted joys, capable, therefore, of keener pains also; or God's principle of continuous advance is contradicted.

Death merely disconnects the spirit from a perishable body, which is dropped and left behind forever. For the decay and reconstitution of that body there is no such waiting as the creeds fancy, nor for a far remote and miraculous assumption of a body in the supposed simultaneous and gen-

[1] To construct a correct doctrine of the future state by any use of such statements as the one above quoted from the Psalms is like attempting to derive accurate information of the interior of the United States as it is to-day from a map fifty years old. To say this is by no means to discredit the inspiration of the Old Testament (that is, in any right and clear thinking on that subject), but simply to do justice to the patent fact which Bible study evinces, that the Holy Scriptures are characterized by a *progress of doctrine* from first to last. *Inspiration* is one thing, *infallibility* another; but the two are generally confounded in Christian thought.

eral reëmbodiment of all that are in the graves. The perishable body no sooner drops away, than the spirit is clothed upon — perhaps in chapter ix. we may see reason to think *clothes itself*, through the operation of fixed and uniform law — with a body suited to an advanced stage of being. It rises into such a condition of existence as it is fitted to rise into. So it was said of Judas, that he went "to his own place." But whether it be "unto life," or "unto judgment," there is no break, no halt, but onward movement ever. So said the poet, —

> "Eternal process moving on,
> From state to state the spirit walks."

This is the *Anastasis* [1] which we are taught in the New Testament, the rising up, or resurrection.

IV. But unless we can see clearly *how* a mistake has originated, we cannot always admit that the mistake exists. The bar to a true and Scriptural doctrine of the resurrection, as exhibited in the foregoing pages, is formed principally by mistaken notions respecting the coming of Christ and the judgment day. The New Testament constantly associates these three ideas: The

[1] See note at the end of this chapter.

coming of the Lord, the rising of the dead, the judgment of the world.

(1.) If the coming of the Lord is still distant, then, as most Christians reason, the resurrection day and the judgment day are likewise distant. So far or so near as the coming is placed, so far or so near everything associated with it in the Scripture prophecies is deemed to be. With the exception of a comparatively small number of Christians, who deem the coming of the Lord to be now impending, the general view relegates it to an indefinite future, and with it the resurrection and the judgment also.

(2.) Again, if the judgment to come is conceived — as I think is commonly the case — after the manner of an earthly tribunal, which at an appointed day opens and goes through its docket, and then adjourns; if our thought sets the opening of some great and general court of God at a far-off point or end of time, till which the due sentencing of all the deeds and misdeeds of the human race is to be waited for, then we shall tend to think of the "resurrection of judgment" as deferred till that court is ready to open. It will seem to us a gen-

eral and simultaneous opening of the court doors to the waiting multitudes.

To suggest that these ideas may be replaced by others more reasonable, and by way of introducing the subjects of the three following chapters, let us glance here at John's vision of resurrection and judgment. (Rev. xx. 12, 13.) This vision was the last which John had in the series which he saw concerning the progress of the kingdom of Christ through conflict up to final glory. But from this finality in *narrative* is it right to infer finality in *fact?* — that no such processes are now going on in the Unseen? — that they will not begin until the present struggles of the advancing kingdom have reached their consummation in glory? This is the inference usually drawn. But let us test it by an illustration.

Suppose that we visit a factory, in which many processes are simultaneously going on. In the basement we see the raw material sorted and cut up. In the next story we see some of the coarser processes. Up and up we go, finer and finer the processes we see, and at last in the upper story we find finishing, inspecting, sorting and boxing. Now, if we should tell a child what we had

seen in that factory, in the order in which we had seen it, he might imagine that the work of those upper rooms was not touched till all the lower work-rooms had stopped work, and every wheel in the preparatory processes was still. Yet that childish inference as to the time when resurrection and judgment begin is actually drawn from John's vision of them, simply because he *narrates it last* in the order of things which he saw. Is it not far more reasonable to regard it as a single glimpse of things which are perpetually going on in the unseen world? While this world's events are taking place, the grave,[1] the sea, are perpetually giving up their dead, and judgment is perpetually passing on the spirits new-born into the future state, as their actual character is revealed to them in conscience as in the sight of God, and as they enter into the appropriate consequences of being what their course here has made them to be,— worthy or unworthy of the "resurrection of life."

The sum of our conclusions thus far is this: The resurrection is ever going on in

[1] The *grave*, not "hell," is the proper rendering of *hades* (ᾅδης), verses 13 and 14.

the invisible world. The continuity of embodied conditions suffers no interruption. All rise at death into a higher stage of being, with higher capacities for every kind of spiritual experience, whether joyful or painful. "The unjust," as well as "the just," are destined to resurrection. And yet it cannot be the same for both. If Paul has to *labor* "to attain *the* resurrection," it is clear that those who do not labor do not attain. *Their* resurrection is simply destitute of whatever they have not labored for. Though they rise from the dead, they rise into being, but not *well*-being, — into a life that is not *life* in fullness of power and of joy. Their resurrection-life cannot be *well*-being, for all well-being comes through struggle, and they have not struggled for spiritual well-being. They have sowed no seed of Christly endeavor, but "whatsoever a man soweth *that* (that only) shall he also reap." (Gal. vi. 7.) Their future life cannot possibly be better than *a state of privation*, corresponding to whatever neglect produced the privation. If this is all we can be sure of, this is enough for any thoughtful mind. Gross exaggerations and wild fancies have invested the mysterious future

with many imaginations, both bright and dark, that thinking men may leave to the poets and the painters, and to the ranters also. But we may be absolutely certain of so much as this. Where no moral and spiritual *effort* has been invested in the future, whether that future be in this life or in any other, there can be no *gain*, no future income of moral and spiritual power and joy and peace in perfectness of life.

How then, O Paul, shall we strive with you, that we may attain with you unto the resurrection of the dead?

Listen to his answer: "But what things were gain to me those I counted loss for Christ. Yea, doubtless, and I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus, my Lord, for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dung, that I may *win Christ*."

Is there any other way in which we may obtain a place among those whom Christ calls "*worthy* to obtain that world and the resurrection from the dead," except the Christly life of humble endeavor after holiness in fellowship with the Father revealed through Christ? This only brings the

spirit to the ripeness of its bud here. This only will unfold out of that bud the flower of the Christian resurrection.

If we see the way, let us walk therein.

NOTE A.

ANASTASIS AND EXANASTASIS.

The word which Paul uses in avowing his effort to "attain unto the resurrection" is a noteworthy word, *exanastasis*, the solitary instance in which this word appears in the New Testament for the usual word, *anastasis*. It is a pregnant word. It signifies not merely resurrection, but resurrection *from* or *out of*, implying an emergence from a condition in which others remain. It thus sets forth in a single emphatic term the idea which, to intensify the whole expression, is conveyed also by the following words, "*from* the dead."

The New Testament regularly uses the phrase "resurrection of the dead" as a general expression of the fact that the dead rise. But it is noteworthy that Christ, in speaking of those "who shall be accounted worthy to obtain the resurrection," phrases it as "resurrection (*anastasis*) *from* the dead," thus expressing the same idea which Paul sets forth in his more intense "*exanastasis from* the dead," the same idea which is involved in the word "worthy" — a precedence of some over others. How this use of words agrees with the idea of the resurrection as the prize of Christian endeavor is easily seen.

NOTE B.

AUGUSTINE'S VIEWS OF FUTURE PUNISHMENT.

It is worth while to compare with the ideas of future punishment which have prevailed alike among Roman Catholics and Protestants, the views entertained on that subject by the church teacher of the primitive period, whom both Catholics and Protestants agree in honoring, and whom Protestants hold in special regard as the spiritual ancestor of the Reformers.

In Augustine's view, "eternal death is a subsidence into a lower form of life, a lapse into an inferior mode of existence, a privation of the highest vital influx from God in order to everlasting life, or supreme beatitude, but not of all vital influx, in order to an endless existence, which is a partial and incomplete participation in good. . . . . There is no trace [in A.'s writings] of the idea that God hates a portion of his creatures with an absolute, infinite, and eternal hatred, and is hated with a perfect and eternally enduring hatred by them in return, to the utmost extent of their capacity. . . . . There is no trace of the idea that God has withdrawn himself from a portion of his creatures, except so far as to retain them in existence, ... that those who die in sin lose all that is good in their nature, and all good of existence, become completely evil, and continue to grow everlastingly in the direction of an infinite wickedness, which merits a corresponding degree of pain. On the contrary, St. Augustine teaches that God preserves in endless existence those creatures who have forfeited their capacity of attaining to the

supreme good, because of the good of which they are still capable. . . . . However great their suffering from the pain of loss or the pain of sense may be, according to the doctrine of St. Augustine it cannot be such throughout eternity as to destroy the good of existence, and make it a pure, unmitigated, penal evil to live forever." (From Brownson's *Quarterly Review*, July, 1863.)

CHAPTER V.

THE COMING OF CHRIST IN HIS KINGDOM A REALITY OF THE PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE.

"Verily, I say unto you, There be some standing here who shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom." — *Matt.* xvi. 28.

I. EIGHTEEN hundred years have passed since the last of a long series of herald voices died upon the air, and transferred its burden to the written page. For a thousand years a succession of such heralds had announced the coming of a kingdom of righteousness and a king of glory. For a thousand years previous, and still further back, further than we can exactly date, a succession of other heralds, only with vision less clear, and voices less distinct, had been heard bidding men look for blessing to One who was to come in a chosen family line. Such is the strain of hope which fills the Bible from beginning to end with an expectation growing more intense as the ages roll by, till, in the closing portions of the New

Testament, men's eyes seem straining to catch the first ray of a rising sun, and the last sentence of the sacred volume seems to concentrate in one breath the hope of all the generations: — "Even so, *come*, Lord Jesus."

That last cry of the heralds was voiced eighteen hundred years ago. Then the era of prophecy closed its record of thousands of years. *Why?* Was it not because the era of its fulfillment had begun? The sudden disappearance of this long stream of prophecy was either because the river had found the sea toward which it had bent its way, or else, because, deprived of an outlet by impenetrable barriers, it had lost its way in some Sahara waste, to disappear amid the sand.

When, however, we say that the era of fulfillment began when the era of prophecy ended, we must be content to assign no larger a meaning to that word "*began*" than history shall justify. The kingdom is represented by the parable of the growing seed, in which there is a flourishing reality before there is ripeness. (Mark iv. 26–29.)

II. Beside that long gone ending of the flow of prophecy that we have noticed, we

must now put one other significant fact, namely: just before the stream disappeared, the herald voices were most clear and frequent in declaring the fulfillment to be *close at hand.*

Christ, who certainly did not in any way manifest himself as a king before his death (if we except the procession on Palm Sunday, and his conversation with Pilate), uttered this unmistakable prophecy of the nearness of a decisive manifestation: —

"Verily I say unto you, There be some standing here which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom." (Matt. xvi. 28.)

With equal explicitness and still greater particularity of detail, he reiterates it in his elaborate prophecy of the impending distresses of Judea and the fall of Jerusalem. After dwelling upon the miseries of that period he goes right on to say: —

"Immediately after the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken:

"And then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven: and then shall all

the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory.

"And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other." (Matt. xxiv. 29–31.)

Observe here the decisive word, "*immediately* after the tribulation of these days." This "immediately" has been strangely ignored, and merely for the reason that the wonders in sun, moon, and stars, the signs of clouds of glory, and hosts of trumpeting angels, have not yet been seen in the sky. But what if the sky be not the place to look for the signs which the Lord gave? What if his words were not literally intended to direct us to search the heavens of astronomy and meteorology for the signs of a spiritual epoch? May it not be wiser to think thus, than to ignore such a word as this "*immediately*"? Especially when our Lord goes right on to add this other note of the nearness of the time: —

"Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled."

What Christ meant by this high-wrought description of the signs of his coming, we shall see by and by. For the present, let us notice that he coupled with his coming such terms as "immediately" and "this generation."

With such words as these to kindle their expectations, the Apostles and the whole church of the first generation lived in a constant expectation of the speedy coming of their Lord in his kingdom and glory. No one has failed to note the fact that in the Apostolic Epistles *the Day of Christ*, *the Day of the Lord's Appearing*, seems very near. The great hope of the first disciples was that they might live to see the day and share its glory.

But the herald Apostles, though, like Moses, they saw the land of promise from afar, and described its glory, like Moses were not suffered to pass over across the dividing stream. One by one they perished under the stroke of martyrdom — all save that one who lived far into the succeeding period in fulfillment of the word, "If I will that he tarry *till I come*." They died, and left no successors to their hope of the Lord's speedy coming. The church of the

next generation, with a lower spiritual temperature, both misconceiving the nature of the Lord's kingdom, and misinterpreting the Lord's signs of his coming, with the spiritual eye shut to much that it might have seen, and the sensuous eye tired of gazing into a vacant sky, gradually remitted this glorious Apostolic hope to the limbo of uncertain expectations. And these things followed: —

(1.) The church began to look away to the indefinite future, and to expect now one and now another catastrophe as the day of the Lord's appearing to make an "end of all things," as, for instance, at the fall of the Roman Empire, or at the completion of a thousand years of the Christian era.

(2.) Many pious and learned men have held that the Apostles were mistaken. Many skeptics have held that Jesus was mistaken. It would seem almost certain that there was a mistake somewhere. We may find reason to judge that the Apostles were right in their hope of the Lord's coming, as a near fact, but wrong in their opinion of the *manner* in which the fact was to be accomplished. We may find reason to think that the church has been mistaken in

thinking of the Lord's coming after the sensuous manner of the Jews, rather than after the spiritual manner of the kingdom of God.

(3.) Ignorant and unspiritual people have taken to predicting a time when the Lord shall come with outward show, until that most glorious hope of the New Testament, the royal advent of our Lord, has furnished, in the name of "Adventist," a term which to most persons suggests a somewhat visionary way of thinking.[1]

III. To the facts already stated, the long flow of prophecy, the sudden cessation of its stream, the declarations of our Lord that his coming and his kingdom were at hand, let us add now this other fact, namely: —

The chief power in the living world today is visibly exercised by our Lord Jesus Christ, visibly, that is, if not to our senses, at least to an open-eyed intelligence. Not without contradiction and antagonism, indeed, but yet gradually overruling contra-

[1] The Adventist delusion will live, as error always lives, on the *half-truth* that is mixed with it, until the truth which gives currency and vitality to the error has full justice done to it by more discerning minds. It is the mangling which some truths have received inside the pale of orthodoxy, to which is due the sincere, however misguided and one-sided, protest of many a creed which is called heresy and delusion.

diction and antagonism. What is called Fenianism in Ireland is subject to the throne it hates. Despite of barbarism in Mississippi and in Africa, Mormonism in Utah, and Islamism in the Orient, Nihilism in Russia, and various forms of Atheism elsewhere, the actual supremacy of the Lord Jesus Christ in this present world is attested to one who reflects on the following facts, namely : —

(1.) Though the nominally Christian part of the world's population is far the smallest part, yet the ruling powers of the world are the nominally Christian nations. Thus, a handful of Englishmen rule Hindostan.

(2.) Though the really Christian part of Christendom is far the smaller part of nominal Christendom, yet the moral supremacy of Christendom is in really Christian hands. By this is meant, not that most of the acknowledged rulers of Christendom are real Christians, but this, rather : That no law or institution is either unchallenged or permanently tolerated in Christendom, after those among whom it exists perceive it to be in conflict with the commandments of Christ. Whenever such a conflict is perceived, directly the moral sen-

timent of Christianity begins to train against the evil an artillery which at length levels it to the ground. Thus Christ has long been giving law to the nations, as the Hebrew prophets foretold. (Isa. ii. 2, 3; Micah iv. 1, 2.)

(3.) Whatever abuses remain, whatever defects appear, the obvious *tendency*, among the ruling nations of the world, is to realize with increasing completeness the supremacy of Christian ideas, as expressed in the precepts and example of Christ. How evidently, for instance, the conviction is gaining ground that the supreme moral force is not fear but love! And thus the world is by degrees being made new.[1]

[1] It used to be supposed that when the world was first made, it was all made at once to assume its present form; that the living world came into existence as it now appears, with an instantaneous completeness, as though the plants and animals, in their several "days," had been struck out each with a die. Now we know that the world and everything in it came into its present appearance by a very gradual process of formation and change. It has also been supposed that the world would be made new all at once. But the new making, "the regeneration" (Matt. xix. 28, — see Note A, at the end of this chapter), is, like the first making, a very gradual process of change under the persistent action of the forces of spiritual development. When we read, "The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend" (Matt. xiii. 41), we must reckon among these "angels" all powers and in-

(4.) Among the inferior nations, which, though not Christian, are subordinated to the Christian powers, there is a constant diffusion of Christian ideas. Whatever missionaries have not yet accomplished, they have certainly planted Christian schools and colleges in great numbers through the non-Christian world. What future ascendency of Christian influence in that portion of the world this points to, one may easily conjecture.

This is no rose-colored view. The unsubdued evils press heavily on our hearts. Many "things that offend" remain to be cast out. But facts that cannot be questioned declare Christ to be *now King* in the existing world. The most potent personal name to-day is his name. The ascendant influence to-day is his influence. No law or institution is unchallenged that is deemed inconsistent with his law. A process of judgment and overthrow is seen working in his interest around the world for the suppression of evils. The whole movement of the world tends toward a bet-

fluences that work for his kingdom in the suppression of antichristian principles and practices. And history shows that these are going down and out, surely; but how slowly our impatience often testifies.

ter subjection to the moral supremacy of Christ. There is no more reason for doubting that Christ has already begun to reign in his kingdom, because some things remain to be cast out and other things to be set in order, than there is for doubting that God is the Maker and Sovereign of the world, because of the abundant evil that still appears in it.

It would seem, therefore, that a fair survey of facts must recognize as now in progress the expansion of that kingdom which our Lord, in beginning his earthly ministry, announced as near. (Matt. iv. 17.) The picture is before our eyes. The outlines are not yet all filled up. There are gaps in the foreground, and gaps in the background, which the pencil of history has yet to fill. But the outlines, at least, are there, corresponding to the shadow which prophecy cast upon the blank canvas more than two thousand years ago. Thus wrote Isaiah (xlii. 1–4): —

"Behold my servant, whom I uphold; mine elect, *in whom* my soul delighteth; I have put my spirit upon him: he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles.

"He shall not cry, nor lift up, nor cause his voice to be heard in the street.

"A bruised reed shall he not break, and the smoking flax shall he not quench: he shall bring forth judgment unto truth.

"He shall not fail nor be discouraged, till he have set judgment in the earth: and the isles shall wait for his law."

Thus the facts of the present moral dominion of Christ correspond to the prophecies of Isaiah and Micah, that to the nations "the law shall go forth from Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem;" for manifestly that was the point whence the law of Christ issued forth upon its great career. (Isaiah ii. 2; Micah iv. 1, 2.)

Evidently the world reveals to our intelligence, as a now existing fact, a spiritual kingdom and Christ its king. This has had a progressive growth, according to that divine law of development, "from the least to the greatest," which everywhere operates. It has also, of course, had its *beginning*. In this beginning we cannot expect that it will be as plainly recognizable as in its more advanced stages. We must not be disappointed if we do not find it beginning in full strength and completeness. But *when*, nevertheless, did it begin? This is not in itself a very important ques-

tion. It is made important only by the fact that the beginning is denied. Many shut their eyes to the fact that the kingdom is now here, because they find no record of any such beginning as they conceive there should have been, when the Son of man came in his kingdom to "sit on the throne of his glory." (Matt. xxv. 31.) Having searched the past in vain for falling stars, darkened sun and moon, and angelic hosts, they say, the Son of man has not come, the Apostles were mistaken, and even Jesus was in error.

IV. We are therefore compelled to inquire about the beginning of the kingdom.

Specially, we must ask what our Lord meant by the *signs* of his coming, as described in Matt. xxiv. 29–31. Here we must rigidly apply the principle, that *the signs must be of the same nature as the kingdom.* If the kingdom belongs to the sphere of the senses, the signs will; otherwise not. If the kingdom is spiritual, the signs will be such as appeal to *intelligence* rather than to sense. It is not reasonable to look for disturbances in the solar system and the starry universe as signs of a spiritual epoch. It is not reasonable to think that

Christ meant that eclipses and clouds of vapor and visible angels, blowing audible trumpets, were to be signs of his assuming a spiritual throne.

(1.) Why, then, did he speak in such terms?

To answer, we must remember that the one book of the Jewish people was the Old Testament. The disciples knew that book well. Our Lord borrows his vivid language about the signs of his coming from the familiar imagery of the ancient prophets. In these, the extinction of the civil and religious luminaries of society, in the destruction of institutions and the overthrow of priests and kings, is pictured as the failing of sun, moon, and stars. Witness a specimen of such language in Isaiah's prophecy of the fall of Babylon: —

"Behold the day of the Lord cometh to lay the land desolate. . . . For the stars of heaven and the constellations thereof shall not give their light: the sun shall be darkened in his going forth, and the moon shall not cause her light to shine." (xiii. 9, 10.)

Now it was perfectly appropriate thus to speak, as our Lord spoke, to hearers whose sacred Scriptures had used such a mode of

speaking about any great change in the social or religious order.[1] For an event was at hand, to which such a mode of speaking was even more appropriate than to the quenching of the luminaries of old Babylon and Egypt. Before the "generation" passed away which heard our Lord speak, that event took place, as he had explicitly foretold (Matt. xxiv. 34), which was necessary to the establishment of his kingdom, and to the manifestation of himself as the moral king of men.

(2.) What, now, was that event?

To answer, we must remember that Christianity first appeared to the world as a new variety of Judaism, a Jewish sect. Jesus was a Jew. His Apostles were Jews. Their first converts were Jews, who continued to adhere to the laws of Moses, and endeavored to make all converts from other nations conform, and expected that the whole religious world would continue to look to Jerusalem and the temple as its

[1] Whether our Lord's hearers understood his references to signs in the heavens literally (as I think probable), or not, the fact remains, that their Holy Scriptures were in their hands, with these records of *fulfilled* prophecy that had been uttered in the same terms, and therefore could no longer be taken literally by any intelligent hearer or reader.

centre. The Epistles of Paul resound with the conflict between the conservative party, who strove to put the "new wine" of Christianity into the "old bottles" of Judaism, and the radical party, headed by Paul, who insisted on "new bottles," and went so far as to abolish the Mosaic Sabbath, and the Abrahamic sacrament of circumcision. But so long as the Levitical priesthood offered sacrifice on the spot consecrated for a thousand years by the ritual of Moses, so long was the claim of Paul to be subject only to the law of Christ, disputed by an appeal to the divine authority of the institutions which held their vantage-ground on the temple mountain. *From that vantage-ground they must be dislodged.* The logic of some such *event* as the demolition of the visible centre and symbol of the outworn dispensation was needed to reinforce the arguments of Paul, that circumcision was "nothing," and the seventh day Sabbath but "a shadow of things to come." Only when that ancient altar was overthrown, and "Moses' seat" displaced, could Christianity be fully extricated from the Jewish matrix in which it had been formed, and manifest itself to the world unencum-

bered with obsolete claims, and owning only Christ as supreme. Thus essential to establish the sole spiritual supremacy of Christ was the great event, in which our Lord foretold that *his royal coming* should be manifest within the lifetime of some of his hearers. It took place in the destruction of Jerusalem (A. D. 70), the demolition of the temple, the extinction of the luminaries — sun, moon, and stars — of the Jewish firmament, the sweeping away of the nation. Then, as foretold, appeared "the sign of the Son of man in heaven," for the Cross rose as the Temple fell. Then began "all the tribes of the earth" to "mourn," for then began to be manifested the Lord's judgment-work that goes on still, in the sweeping away of obstructions to his kingdom, with all who cling to them and insist on maintaining them. Then men saw — whether or no they recognized what they saw — "the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory," overshadowingly, irresistibly, triumphantly coming amid the cloudy troubles of that stormy and tempestuous time. Then began the "angels" of the Son of man "with a great trumpet sound"

to gather "his elect from the four winds of heaven," for the heralds of "the gospel of the kingdom" were heard, trumpet-tongued, with augmenting power, in all quarters of the world.

The principle on which we must hold this to be the only reasonable explanation of the terms in which our Lord gave the signs of his coming in his kingdom is this: That when an event is taking place in the spiritual realm of *ideas*, the indications and signs must be such as appeal to the perception of *thought* rather than to the perception of *sense*.

One may say, indeed: Was not the fall of the Jewish temple an event in the physical world, just as much as the fall of stars? Yes, and so also was the appearance of the Man Christ Jesus among men an event in the physical world. But such events, though they must be *in* the physical world in order to be recognized at all, *belong* rather to the ideal world. Their value and significance lie not so much in the things seen as in the things unseen. Their appeal is more to our thoughts than to our senses. The Jewish institutions represented certain religious ideas. Their fall was the

fall of those ideas, betokening *a change* and *an era* in the spiritual realm of thought and feeling, of which the fall of stars could have betokened nothing. All of Christ's teaching went in this direction, — to turn men's minds from the outward to the inward view of things, from the "flesh" to the "spirit."

"It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I speak unto you, *they* are spirit, and *they* are life." (John vi. 63.)

Unless we think it fit to estimate events by their *outward show and noise* more than by their *weight as causes in the ideal world of thought and spirit*, we cannot fail to recognize the overthrow of that city and temple, which stood as the centre and the symbol of an obsolete order of things opposing the establishment of Christ's supremacy, as *the date*, so far as we need a date, of the manifestation of Christ's enthronement as the spiritual king of the living world. Thus, we reckon the years of our nation from the Declaration of Independence, although that Declaration had to be made good by years of war, and the national life had to linger on through years of suspense till the subsequent formation of the Constitution of the

"more perfect Union." Thus the newly inaugurated kingdom had its era of struggle through persecution, and its period of suspense, when it seemed a question whether it might not come to nought. So the morning sun often mounts through battling clouds, which are not burnt away till noon. But we consider that *the day begins with sunrise.*

Our Lord then, as I consider, has come, *because he is here.* Not here merely in an invisible spiritual presence, but here in a plainly recognizable presence, his name the reigning name, his influence the ascendant influence, his thought the dominant thought in the world we live in. The word our Lord applies to his coming — PAROUSIA — signifies in strictness PRESENCE. His coming was a coming in order to be present, a *coming to stay.* The Christian period, now nearly 1900 years in progress, is the period of our Lord's recognized presence in the world, with increasing manifestation of his spiritual power as king and judge of men.

Christ's presence-period in this world is parallel (as I shall endeavor to explain in chapter viii.) with the resurrection-period in the next world. Conformably to this view we find the New Testament con-

stantly associating the two ideas of the coming of the Lord and the resurrection. The idea of judgment is also linked closely with these two. So far or so near as is the judgment, so far or so near is also the resurrection. Here, then, we must inquire next into this also, whether the judgment, which the popular mind relegates to the end of time, and with it the resurrection, is not rather a thing of the present, like the coming and presence of the Lord as our king.

V. Before entering, however, on this next chapter of our inquiry, one may ask at this point, Must we, then, give up the traditional idea of a Christ to come with clouds, in dazzling light, begirt with hosts of angels, amid the attendant terrors of earth's final catastrophe? It seems to me that we must. The sayings of our Lord, which have been thought to foretell such an event, being found to carry quite another meaning, there is no further ground on which to hold to the traditional notion of the second advent.[1] That notion is a thoroughly Jewish one, and has no place in a thoroughly Christian way of thinking upon the kingdom of heaven. More, how-

[1] See Note B, at the end of this chapter.

ever, will require to be said of this subsequently, as other passages of the New Testament shall come up for examination. For the present, what has now been advanced clears the doctrine of the resurrection from the requirement of any *delay*, as supposed to be necessary, that it may take place at the coming of the Lord, as an event that is still postponed. For the future, we may rely only on the *progressive character* of the kingdom of our Lord.

To think of Christ as coming by and by in outward displays to the senses to set up his kingdom upon earth, is not intelligent, because it ignores the testimony of intelligent observation in the present and the past, which affirms that kingdom to be a now existing fact, and a now expanding power. To expect that Christ will by and by manifest himself as king in this world, in a bodily form, and in a special locality as the centre of his kingdom, is not intelligent, because it ignores the spiritual method of his rule, and expects the movement of his kingdom to change from that of an *inwardly developing life* to that of an outward mechanism. But as Paul wrote to the Galatians (iii. 3), "having begun in the spirit" we

are not to be "perfected in the flesh." The manner of our Lord's kingdom hitherto will doubtless be its manner henceforward. Observe, — its *manner*, not its measure. Its measure is no less than the unknown possibilities of an *unbounded progress*.

Believing this, while believing with the fullest confidence that the Son of man has come in his kingly glory, and longing for larger disclosures of his glory as "Lord of all," we still join in the prayer of the first disciples: "THY KINGDOM COME."

NOTE A.

ON "THE REGENERATION."

And Jesus said unto them, Verily I say unto you, That ye which have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel. (Matt. xix. 28.)

This puzzling passage becomes full of light when set in the view now taken, namely, that the Son of man has come in his kingdom, and is ruling the world as king with a constantly extending sway, and is making the world new (that is, renovating or "regenerating" it), not all at once, but by a constantly advancing process of change for the better.

Premising here, simply, that the word which our

version renders "regeneration" (*palingenesia*) is generally accepted as denoting a restored and renovated condition of the world, in a moral point of view, attention needs to be called here mainly to this point, namely, that, according to our Lord's prophecy, this renovation, or regeneration, whenever it is displayed to view, will be signalized by a certain enthronement of the disciples and their Master.

If now we should find the disciples enthroned in any such way as to exhibit to us an adequate fulfillment of the portion of this prophecy which relates to them, such a fact would go far to demonstrate that the enthronement of their Master had also taken place. For the two are declared to be coincident. "*When the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory*, ye also shall sit on twelve thrones," etc. Now such an enthronement of the disciples has, beyond a doubt, actually come to pass, as we shall see. So far as we recognize this, we must recognize, as a fact inseparable from it, that the Son of man also now "sits in the throne of his glory."

How the disciples understood the prophecy is not of much consequence. In all probability they misunderstood it. They grasped it mechanically, no doubt, anticipating that they were to occupy visible judgment-seats, as being, so to speak, associate justices with their Master in a grand court presided over by him in bodily presence, as judge-in-chief. The same misunderstanding probably dominates the minds of most who read this passage to-day.

And yet our Lord's words have received a spiritual fulfillment far surpassing in its grandeur all such mechanical anticipations.

The twelve tribes of the Christian Israel, the whole church, all its schisms notwithstanding, has for ages looked up to the Apostles as occupants of such judgment-thrones as our Lord's promise assigned them. The Apostles have been, through their writings, the judges of the Christian world, the expounders of Christ's law. Every heresy has been cited before them for trial. Every controversy respecting church order or Christian doctrine has been carried up to them for decision. The sentences which they have been regarded as pronouncing have been reverently claimed to be decisive, and have been accepted as the judgment of the Lord himself, delivered through them.

What accomplishment of that prophecy could be grander than a historical fact like this — the spectacle of those Apostles, despised and rejected by the world in their day, but for ages enjoying this spiritual enthronement with their Lord, century after century regulating Christian life, reforming Christian thought, directing spiritual progress as the immortal arbiters of truth?

If our Lord did not mean just this, one thing is certain. We cannot conceive of a grander fulfillment of his words. We can think of one with more show and noise, but not of one possessing essentially greater majesty.

But, whatever fulfillment we recognize here in the case of the Apostles we have to recognize also in the case of Christ. The same glance by which we recognize their present undoubted spiritual enthronement includes also, above them, the throne of the glory of the Son of man, in this "regeneration" or

renovated world. If it cannot be denied that the Apostles now sit on these spiritual thrones of judgment, no more can it be doubted that he also now sits with them and above them; that *his* voice is heard *giving judgment*, as well as theirs. The fulfillment of this prophecy has therefore taken place; that is, it has *begun* its fulfillment. The event spoken of in the same words, both in this text and in that other text which is commonly understood to refer to a judgment at the end of time (Matt. xxv. 31), has come to pass. For this last, see chapter vii.

More will be said on this subject of judgment in the next chapter. Only let it here be noticed, that when we speak of this prophecy as fulfilled, we mean that it has *begun* to be fulfilled. More strictly, it is *fulfilling*. "The regeneration," with its parallel processes of judgment, is now going on, not yet complete. Doubtless there is far more to come. But it is to come *after the same manner. It is not intelligent to expect that the manner will change from that of spiritual power to that of outward form.*

NOTE B.

ON THE ANGELS' PROPHECY OF CHRIST'S COMING.

And while they looked steadfastly toward heaven as he went up, behold, two men stood by them in white apparel;

Which also said, Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? this same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like

manner as ye have seen him go into heaven. (Acts i. 10, 11.)

The angels' saying has been generally regarded as a plain prophecy of a coming within the sphere of the senses. It would very naturally be so understood by those who heard the angels so speak. Especially would it be so understood by minds imbued as the minds of the Apostles were, with the ideas, current among their countrymen, of a coming of the Messiah in glory outwardly displayed. And as their eyes had seen him go, naturally they would think their eyes should see him come. And yet, mark, it is not said, "Ye shall *see* him come;" only, "He shall (or will) come." The seeing, or the recognizableness, of his coming, is at most only an inference from what the angels said, however clear and legitimate the inference be.

It is written, however, "Shall so come in like manner." There are several other passages in which the words here translated "in like manner" occur, but only here are they so rendered. In Matt. xxiii. 37, they are rendered "even as." In Luke xiii. 34, Acts vii. 28, 2 Tim. iii. 8, they are rendered "as." In all these passages every one will see that the idea presented is that of a *real* resemblance, but not a *formal* resemblance. Jannes and Jambres opposing Moses with magical enchantments, and heretical teachers opposing the Apostles with false doctrines, present a real resemblance under very dissimilar forms; but the real likeness of the two cases is expressed by the words which compare Christ's coming to his going, "in like manner as." This

idea of a real resemblance is intensified, in the angels' prophecy, by one added word, "so" — "shall *so* come," etc. This word, however, does not change the idea, does not import that the resemblance is formal as well as real; it only emphasizes the fact that it is real.

Thus, indeed, it has been generally understood. Whatever conceptions of the second advent have been held, nothing is plainer than the fact, that the words "so, in like manner," have been generally construed freely, not strictly, to signify a *like reality*, not a *like manner*. The going was secluded, private, noiseless, without outward sign of change, save in the ascending motion, the mere rising and vanishing of a familiar human form in the air. Nothing could be more unlike this going, *in manner*, than such a coming as is pictured in the traditional expectations of the second advent, with clouds, angels, fire, judgment terrors, and divine glories.

Evidently the church has consistently regarded the prophetic "so in like manner" as a declaration, not of the strict manner of the coming, but of its reality, and its recognizableness.

The Lord had really gone. He would so come (as really) as they had seen him go. Thus the angels prophesied, and thus the church has understood, besides finding here an implication, additionally, that this real coming would also be a recognizable coming.

The mistake has been in thinking and affirming that the recognizableness of the coming would be within the sphere of the senses. In this expectation the church, as a whole, still cleaves to the old Jew-

ish notion of a Messianic display of glory and power in the visible sky and in the world of external forms. Christians still deserve the angels' expostulation, "Why stand ye gazing up into heaven?" Look upon the world with a more thoughtful insight into spiritual facts, and see that the Lord *has come*.

Here the reader must be content with a simple reference to fuller discussions than present limits permit, such as "The Parousia," by Dr. Warren, or my short "Essay upon the Gospel of Matthew."

The reality of our Lord's coming is recognizable by a clear-eyed spiritual intelligence, intent upon the facts and methods of his growing kingdom of the Spirit in the world. A Christian, as distinct from a Jewish, method of interpreting prophecy, discerns that he has come, that he is coming still, in clearer, stronger, grander manifestations of his spiritual sovereignty over men; and that he is still to come, — not by catastrophe but by development, — in his consummate and universally recognized glory as the Spiritual Head of our race. Thus his presence (*parousia*) in a growing influence is a perpetual fact through all the Christian centuries, an age-long reign in a continually ascending supremacy, "till he hath put all things under his feet."

NOTE C.

ON THE RESURRECTION AT CHRIST'S COMING.

For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.

But every man in his own order; Christ the first-fruits; afterward they that are Christ's at his coming. (1 Cor. xv. 22, 23.)

This is a specimen passage of a number in which the resurrection is closely associated with the coming of Christ. One word in it, however, demands special attention before its full scope is examined.

The word here translated "*at*" (ἐν) means either *at* or *in*. It depends wholly on the translator's notion of the word it stands with, whether to say *at* or *in*. If the coming of Christ is *a simple event*, like sunrise, we may say "at his coming." But if it be a coming *that advances and matures through a period until a consummation*, we may say *in*, or *during*, his coming. In the same way, as will be shown subsequently (chapter viii.), where our translators (as in John vi. 40) say "*at* the last day," because of their notion of that "day" as a day in the same sense that Easter day is a day, we, thinking of that day as a *period*, like the days of creation, say "*in* the last day."

It has been shown in the foregoing chapter that Christ's coming is more than a simple advent; it is a coming to be continually present in the world as its spiritual king, a *coming and presence* as the original word "*parousia*" means. We regard it, therefore, not as a simple event, *at* which another event may occur, but as *the period* of an age-long development of the growing power and glory of him who has come to be "with us always even to the end" (Matt. xxviii. 20), the period *in* which his resurrection-power is made manifest. Instead, therefore, of thinking of those who are Christ's being raised to life *at* a time when an instantaneous advent gives the signal, we are to think of them as rising into life *in and throughout the whole period*, during which the

gospel power makes his presence known. More of this is said in chapters viii. and ix.

The question has been raised, whether this prophecy of the resurrection of life is a *limited* one, or unlimited, — whether *all* who "die in Adam" are to be "made alive in Christ." The language of verse 22 is absolutely unlimited in terms, — "in Adam all, in Christ all." The whole argument, it is true, runs from verse 12 onward, wholly in the line of the Christian hope, which had been shaken by denials of the resurrection. This is held to limit the "all." But the Christian hope is not a selfish one; "not for us only, but for the whole world," says John (1, ii. 2). "God," says Paul, "is the Saviour of all men, specially of those that believe" (1 Tim. iv. 10,), and "will have all men to be saved" (1 Tim. ii. 4). In this "all," therefore, the Christian hope, toward which the whole argument runs, must include the greatest number possible. It may be said, however, that the Apostle's subsequent expression, "they that are Christ's at his coming," shows that he was thinking only of Christians, when he said, just before, that "in Christ shall all be made alive." This is not to the point. For, of course, in his view, no one could be made alive in Christ without being also a Christian.

Limiting the "all" as the scope of the argument for the Christian hope requires, and granting that verse 22 means that "as in Adam all who are Adamic die, so in Christ shall all who are Christ's be made alive;" the very nature of the Christian hope, as a hope for mankind, raises this question: Whether the Christians made alive in Christ are

only the Christians *of this world*, — how many of the vast multitude who go into the future world utterly ignorant of Christ and of his gospel may be embraced in this ultimate hope of life in Christ.

It would be hard to say what was in Paul's mind upon this subject, were this the only passage in which he has come near this deeply interesting question. There are, however, three other passages, in which he speaks more positively, namely: —

"That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth [that is, in the regions of the dead], and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." (Phil. ii. 10, 11.)

"For it pleased *the Father* that in him [Christ] should all fullness dwell. And, having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, *I say*, whether *they be* things in earth, or things in heaven." (Col. i. 19, 20.)

"That in the dispensation of the fullness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth, *even* in him." (Eph. i. 10.)

These three great prophecies speak unqualifiedly of an ultimate reconciliation to God of whatever shall exist. "All existences" is the close equivalent of the term "all things," for which the Greek employs no substantive, as "things," but uses only a plural adjective, signifying *being* in general. Whatever additional light the passage before us in 1 Corinthians can receive, must be sought from these three.

To estimate fairly the force of these four separate prophecies, all unqualified as the Apostle utters them, I ask, Would an orthodox preacher, discoursing now upon the ultimate extent of Christ's salvation, think he had sufficiently *guarded the doctrine* if he should *simply paraphrase Paul's words* in these four texts, — if he should abstain from adding at least a cautionary word or two to intimate to his hearers that the redemption would nevertheless *not* ultimately include *all then in existence*, — if he should fail at least to hint that even then the dark prison-house of endless despair would include vast multitudes of impenitent souls? Judged by certain standards of the modern, if not of the Biblical, sort, Paul's omission to "cover" that point is remarkable. And it is also remarkable that nowhere else, in all that he has written, does he cover it. Was it then, in his view, a *real* point to cover?

The impression which these three texts naturally make upon the ordinary reader is fairly reflected in the remarks made upon the second of the three by two commentators of orthodox sentiments and of the highest learning.

Dr. H. A. W. Meyer: "The only right sense is, thus, that through Christ the whole universe shall be reconciled with God."

Bishop Ellicott: "It *does* say that the eternal and incarnate Son is the '*causa medians*' by which the absolute totality of created things shall be restored into its primal harmony with its Creator — more than this it *does not* say, and where God is silent it is not for man to speak."

Nevertheless, the most universal terms, the most sweeping statements, are always tacitly understood

to be subject to such necessary limitations as *the nature of the case* imposes. Thus, in saying God can do anything, we do not mean to say that he can do what is wrong or inconsistent. So in the present instance, the comprehensive "all" must be taken to mean *all who are capable*, through their free choice, of life through Christ. Such, and only such, will come into the number of "those who are Christ's" in the period of his coming and presence.

Such a limitation in the nature of things Christ seems to hint of in the sin which is forgiven "neither in this world nor in the world to come." (Matt. xii. 32.) Intimations of impossibilities arising from the condition of the spirit itself are found in Christ's strong expressions, "Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers," etc. (Matt. xxiii. 33.) Free will has play hereafter, but the laws of habit and character have force also. "All shall be made alive" *who can be*, is the utmost that can be concluded. That *all can be* is the hope held by many, but a hope without any positive guarantee.

Yet the Apostle Paul has left on record those plain prophecies that there shall be an ultimate and final reconciliation to God of all who exist. This, then, in connection with the present statement, leads to the inference that all who are incapable of being "made alive in Christ" will have ceased to exist before the end.

Here we have touched, but cannot pursue, the subject of "conditional immortality," a doctrine at present strongly supported, and a relief, as many deem it, from the contradiction which the notion of an endless misery presents, in many minds, to the Christian conception of God.

CHAPTER VI.

JUDGMENT A PRESENT AND PERPETUAL REALITY IN BOTH WORLDS.

"It is he which was ordained of God to be the Judge of quick and dead." — *Acts* x. 42.

THE connection in which the ideas of resurrection and judgment stand in the New Testament requires us to study the general subject of the divine judgment for the sake of relieving the subject of the resurrection of some misconceptions attached to it by misconceptions on the subject of judgment. It is popularly supposed that there must be a delay of resurrection until the time has arrived for the yet distant judgment to take place. But what if the judgment is not distant? What if it is now going on? What if it is to go on only as it now goes?

The thoughtful reader of the Bible cannot fail to be impressed by the frequent recurrence of that solemn word of righteousness — JUDGMENT. The New Testament

unfolds a view of *future* judgment which is not apparent in the Old. But that revelation of the *present* judgment which is so prominent in the Old is obscured in the New through a traditional misunderstanding, which has settled on many passages, one instance of which was exhibited in Note A, at the end of the preceding chapter.

The certainty of judgment beyond the grave is testified by reiterated declarations of Christ and his Apostles. What the Master said of the "resurrection of judgment" the disciples repeat in saying, "after death, judgment." "The dead, small and great," are seen in vision standing before the judgment throne. There every man must appear [1] to "receive the things done in the body, whether good or bad."

Such testimonies, *coupled with misunderstandings* which we are soon to notice, have created a way of thinking on this subject, which relegates judgment to the other side of the grave, and fails to recognize it duly as it is proceeding here, according to

[1] "For all of us must needs be made manifest before the judgment seat of Christ." (2 Cor. v. 10.) (*Literally.*)

our Lord's emphatic declaration, "*now* is the judgment of this world." (John xii. 31.) Judgment goes before death as well as after. "After death, judgment," not "*the* judgment; our translators slipped in that little word. (Heb. ix. 27.) No man by dying gets away from judgment. Nor does any man have to wait for it till after death.

I. But *what* is judgment? It is: —

(1.) *Experience* of the good or evil results of the course we take, with the divine law or against it.

It is also: —

(2.) A *revelation* in each man's consciousness of those results as the fruit of his obedience or disobedience to the divine law.

It is plain that the first of these may exist without the second. The results of action cannot fail to follow, or begin to follow, immediately after action. The man who perpetrates a crime, however successfully, suffers an immediate result in the hardening and depraving of his moral nature, and this result is, essentially, his judgment, whether it be immediately revealed to him as such, or not.

It is also plain that the second element in judgment may be delayed long after the first. The transgressor may successfully blind himself to his condition, as hardened, depraved, and worsening. In other words, he is simply unconscious of the work of judgment that is actually going on within him, in the degradation and growing ruin of his nature. When the time comes for this to flash upon him, and consume him with shame and agony, the judgment of which he then becomes conscious is simply a *revelation*,[1] or discovery, of the judgment that has been working in him since his evil course began. The discovery did not *make* the judgment. It only brought it to light in the man's own consciousness.

II. But *where* is judgment? Wherever *law* is, there is judgment. Judgment, as distinct from the consciousness of judgment, is simply the experience of the consequences of acting according to or against the divine law. As soon as a transgressor begins to break the thorn hedge with which the law has marked and secured the right way, so soon the retributive thorns begin to tear. The great catastrophe which

[1] See chapter ix. toward the close.

shakes a continent when human slavery comes to a bloody end is only the conspicuous climax of a long series of judgment evils, which had been slowly blighting a land and barbarizing a people. The unconsciousness of those who were hugging the curse to their bosoms, and blindly glorying in its stupefying illusions, was deemed by those who watched the growth of the cancer as one of the very grimmest in all the train of judgment-consequences.

Judgment, then, is as eternal and as constantly operative as is law. It *is*, in fact, the operation of law, in blessing the obedient and bringing wrath upon the disobedient. From the beginning to the end of action under law, judgment follows every being through the universe of God wherever law extends.

Thinking in this way upon the subject of judgment, we shall avoid the mistakes that ensue upon our likening the divine judgment to a human court, which opens at a certain place and time, hears, tries, sentences, and, having gone through the docket, adjourns. The divine judgment never waits to open, and never stands adjourned, not even as a "last judgment," so

long as there lives a created being in obedience or in disobedience to the law of God. Its efficiency is as conspicuous in the blessing of the righteous as in the curse of the wicked; though this last is chiefly thought of among sinners. We are to think of it not as an *event*, limited to a specific "day," but as a *process*, which runs its course throughout the whole existence of the responsible subjects of law.

What, then, must we understand in Paul's saying, that God "hath appointed *a day* in which he will judge the world in righteousness"? (Acts xvii. 31.) What must we understand in John's saying, that he saw "the dead, small and great, stand before God?" (Rev. xx. 12.) We must understand that "*day*" to be a period not the same as that from sunrise to sunset. We must understand that standing before God to be something different from what could be formally delineated in a picture. John's vision was not representative but suggestive, not a mechanical copy but a shadow of a spiritual reality. There is no such *throne*, but there is a real *judgment*, of which the throne and the standing before it are purely imaginative symbols and shad-

ows. And John's vision was simply his momentary glimpse of an eternal process. He had it at the end of a series of visions relating to the course of earthly history. He came to it as a visitor comes to the last room in a picture gallery. He narrates it last in the order of the things he saw. But the room is there with its pictures before the visitor comes, and after he goes. And thus the divine judgment is eternally going on, as unintermitted as is the operation of the law, that "whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap." It *is*, in fact, nothing but the operation of that law in bringing consequences to pass.

Unless we bring this mode of thinking to the interpretation of the Scripture doctrine of judgment, we shall reduce the spiritual and eternal processes of the moral universe to the mechanical forms of such a judgment as has been painted by Michael Angelo.

III. To what has now been said as to the true mode of thinking on this subject, we must add careful notice of some special points, namely: —

(1.) The Scriptures have absolutely nothing to say of any general judgment of mankind, collectively, to occur after the earthly

course of things is run. If this seems to any reader a startling assertion, he will do well to look carefully at the evidence, for it is unquestionably true.

Matthew xiii. 40–42, 49, 50, will be immediately cited as demonstrating a divine judgment at "the end of the world." But this goes for nothing, when we turn to Heb. ix. 26, and read, that the death of Christ took place "in the end of the world." The original phrase and the English translation agree in both passages. As to the death of Christ, we can only understand "the end of the world," in which it took place, to be the *final period* of the world, regarded as the end, or consummation, of the preparatory ages. Unless some sufficient reason can be found for assigning to the phrase in Matthew an entirely different sense from the same phrase in Hebrews, that judgment "at the end of the world" turns out to be judgment in a period of earthly history that is still in progress.[1]

The passage in Matt. xxv. 31–46, supposed to describe "the last judgment," requires more extended discussion, which will occupy the next chapter.

[1] See my *Essay on the Gospel according to Matthew.* W. A. Wilde & Co., Boston.

(2.) The Scriptures represent the kingdom of Christ as a period of judgment.

The ancient idea of sovereignty combined in one person those functions of governing and of judging which modern ideas have separated. The ancient kings sat on judgment seats to administer justice. The Old Testament prophecies of the kingdom of Christ describe him as coming to "judge the nations" (Isa. ii. 4), and to "set judgment in the earth." (Isa. xlii. 4.) As shown in the preceding chapter, a spiritual kingdom, with Christ as its king, is an existing fact in the present world. So far as he is king, he is also judge of men, in the Biblical conception, not waiting the coming of the end of time to ascend a throne of judgment, but now occupying that throne, and administering throughout the centuries a work of judgment. (See Note A, at the end of the preceding chapter.)

The New Testament exhibits this fact in great prominence. While it extends Christ's judgment work beyond the grave, in telling us that we must appear [literally, "be manifested"] before him to receive the things done in the body (2 Cor. v. 10), it extends this judgment work over the pres-

ent also, over the living, as well as the dead. (Acts x. 42.) This is Christ's own testimony to himself: "The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment to the Son,[1] that all men should honor the Son even as they honor the Father. (John v. 22, 23.) The reference of this judgment to present time is unquestionable, since it is a *present honor* that all are to yield, as to a present judge. This judgeship of Christ is closely connected with his coming in his kingdom.

"For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works.

"Verily I say unto you, There be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom." (Matt. xvi. 27, 28.)

Whatever cause we have thus far found to think that the Son of man has come in his kingdom, will incline us to think that his judgment seat has already been erected in the world.

[1] A very profound truth is here touched by the Evangelist, namely, that, in the nature of things, if we are to feel ourselves *judged* by God at all, it cannot be by an unknown God, but only by God as *revealed;* that is, of course, by God as revealed in his Son Jesus Christ.

(3.) A survey of the period of Christianity, thus far, reveals a work of judgment as running on through the centuries. There was judgment in constant execution before Christ, in the retributive operation of the divine law, both with blessing and in wrath. Of this the Old Testament is full. *Judgment* by no means began when the Son of man came in his kingdom, but the *agency of Christ in judgment* began to be manifested in the casting out of evil, in the purging of the church and the world from the obstructions to the progress of his kingdom. So far as the agency of Christ is a more perfect agency for the work of revealing and condemning and casting out all obstacles to his reigning over men in truth and righteousness and love, so far the work of judgment must proceed, during the Christian period, more thoroughly, manifestly, effectively, than ever before. Now just this, which we must admit to be true, characterizes the period of Christ's presence in his kingdom as, in a special sense, a *period of judgment* — a judgment "day," we may term it, a day of ages, like the days of creation.

Comparing the Christian period, thus

far, with a period of equal duration before Christ, we notice a marvelous difference in moral progress. Inveterate evils, that had held their ground from the time of primeval man, have been gradually disappearing under the ban of Christ, condemned and cast out by that "spirit of power and of love and of a sound mind" which is slowly, but steadily, diffusing itself through the world from Christ. Infanticide, slavery, cruelty to criminals, neglect of the helpless, wars of conquest, religious persecution, tyrannical government, barbarous laws, have all shrunk under the ban of that spirit of moral purity and intelligence which Christ communicates to man. The Son of man has evidently been sending forth his "angels," the varied powers, personal and impersonal, that follow in his train — the influences not only of religion, but of commerce, learning, art, etc., and they have been gathering out of his kingdom "the things that offend." (Matt. xiii. 41.) Incomplete as the work may be, no one can doubt that it is going on. Christ's own words describe it as a present fact tending toward a future consummation. "Now *is* the judgment of this world, now *shall* the prince of this world

be cast out." (John xii. 31.) It is precisely such a work that fitly characterizes the Christian period as *a period of judgment* on all that opposes the sway of Christ as king. It is the relation of Christ to such a work, as the centre and soul of the agencies that are effectively discovering and banning and purging away the evils of the world, which justifies us in regarding him as to-day the occupant of his judgment throne in a growing sovereignty of moral glory and power.

(4.) Christ's judgment work extends into the future. The sentences of righteousness which he has pronounced in his Gospel will be fully written out, not only in the experience of the world, but in the experience of individual souls, "that *every man* may receive the things done in the body." Every conscience will, sooner or later, experience this revelation, or discovery, of the divine judgment as accomplished in itself; will recognize in its personal experience the fulfillment of the righteous sentence which Christ, both as king and judge, has uttered in his Gospel. This revelation of judgment will be in the strictest sense *before Christ*, not in external form, but in inward consciousness, contemplating, on one hand, the

law of Christ, and on the other one's own personal character, and the consequences of having that character as *the net result of the deeds done in the body.*

Such a day of judgment awaits every man in that solemn chamber of conscience, in which the spirit, facing the realities of its present condition as the result of its past action, pronounces on itself, with joy or grief, the sentence of the divine law, as in the presence of its judge and of its future. For such a judgment no public theatre, no universal concourse, is requisite, and none has been announced. Unless we expect God to introduce a radical change in his methods of executing and revealing his judgments, it is utterly unreasonable to expect that he will undertake any grand scenic representation, and gather together all men and angels, in order to proclaim to *ears* what has been sufficiently demonstrated to *consciences.*

It may be granted to any one who urges it, that the Scriptures undoubtedly convey the impression that there is to be a grand and general clearing up of the ways of God by something that may be called judgment. We must beware, however, of re-

ducing such a fact to the mechanical proportions of a fresco painting. Such a result might issue as certainly and as clearly from a *process*, requiring ages for its accomplishment in the gradual operation of law, as from a *catastrophe*, taking place in an hour. And observation assures us that God's revelations follow the method of *development* rather than that of catastrophe. Abraham's assurance, that the Judge of all the earth does right (Gen. xviii. 25) will be vindicated sufficiently to all by the grand *result* to which the long judgment process comes, when "all things that offend" shall have sunk under condemnation, and "the new heavens and the new earth in which dwelleth righteousness" shall be revealed in their final "beauty of holiness."

So far as the present chapter has given reason to think that there is no grand and general and catastrophic judgment-day to be waited for, the associated idea that there must be a waiting for a grand and general resurrection-day, in order to such a judgment, has failed to find ground for its support.

The traditional conceptions of this subject are, however, closely bound up with a

traditional misunderstanding of a section of the Gospel according to Matthew, in, or rather *into*, which there has been read the doctrine of a final judgment-day, universal, scenic, and catastrophic, according to the famous picture of Michael Angelo. This requires study and restatement, and must next be taken in hand.

NOTE.

JUDGMENT AS REPRESENTED IN THE CREEDS IN CONNECTION WITH THE RESURRECTION.

THE following extract from "The Larger Catechism" of the Presbyterian Church, as adopted and ratified by the Synod of New York and Philadelphia in 1788, may stand here in contrast with the views presented in the preceding chapter, as well as in the following, as a fair expression of the prevailing mode of Christian thought upon the subject.

Q. 87. *What are we to believe concerning the resurrection?*

A. We are to believe that at the last day there shall be a general resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust. When they that are then found alive shall in a moment be changed, and the self-same bodies of the dead which were laid in the grave, being then again united to their souls forever, shall be raised up by the power of Christ. The bodies of the just, by the spirit of Christ, and by

virtue of his resurrection as their head, shall be raised in power, spiritual and incorruptible, and made like to his glorious body; and the bodies of the wicked shall be raised up in dishonor by him as an offended judge.

Q. 88. *What shall immediately follow after the resurrection?*

A. Immediately after the resurrection shall follow the general and final judgment of angels and men, the day and hour whereof no man knoweth, that all may watch and pray, and be ever ready for the coming of the Lord.

Q. 89. *What shall be done to the wicked at the day of judgment?*

A. At the day of judgment, the wicked shall be set on Christ's left hand, and, upon clear evidence and full conviction of their own consciences, shall have the fearful but just sentence of condemnation pronounced against them; and thereupon shall be cast out from the favorable presence of God and the glorious fellowship with Christ, his saints, and all his holy angels, into hell, to be punished with unspeakable torments both of body and soul, with the devil and all his angels forever.

Q. 90. *What shall be done to the righteous at the day of judgment?*

A. At the day of judgment, the righteous, being caught up to Christ in the clouds, shall be set on his right hand, and there, openly acknowledged and acquitted, shall join with him in the judging of reprobate angels and men, and shall be received into heaven, where they shall be fully and forever freed from all sin and misery, filled with inconceivable

joys, made perfectly holy and happy both in body and soul in the company of innumerable saints and angels, but especially in the immediate vision and fruition of God the Father, of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit, to all eternity. And this is the perfect and full communion which the members of the invisible church shall enjoy with Christ in glory, at the resurrection and day of judgment.

CHAPTER VII.

"THE LAST JUDGMENT" NOT DELAYED TILL THE RESURRECTION.

"Now is the judgment of this world." — *John* xii. 31.

"WHEN the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory:

"And before him shall be gathered all nations: and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth *his* sheep from the goats:

"And he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left.

"Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world:

"For I was an hungered, and ye gave me meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me in:

"Naked, and ye clothed me: I was sick,

and ye visited me: I was in prison, and ye came unto me.

"Then shall the righteous answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungered, and fed *thee?* or thirsty, and gave *thee* drink?

"When saw we thee a stranger, and took *thee* in? or naked, and clothed *thee?*

"Or when saw we thee sick, or in prison, and came unto thee?

"And the King shall answer and say unto them, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye have done *it* unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done *it* unto me.

"Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels:

"For I was an hungered, and ye gave me no meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me not in: naked, and ye clothed me not: sick, and in prison, and ye visited me not.

"Then shall they also answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungered, or athirst, or a stranger, or naked, or sick, or in prison, and did not minister unto thee?

"Then shall he answer them, saying, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye did *it* not to one of the least of these, ye did *it* not to me.

"And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal." (Matt. xxv. 31–46.)

This last third of the twenty-fifth chapter of Matthew has generally been understood to be a prophetic picture of the judgment of the entire race of mankind, to take place at the end of time. It is commonly taken to be a description of "The Last Judgment," a great and general court of God, in which all the deeds of earthly time are to be reviewed and sentenced for all eternity. Whether it is really that, and what it is if not really that, is the present object of inquiry.

If our study should lead us to conclusions widely different from the traditional opinion, it will not be the first time that Biblical study has given a changed view of an important subject. All that part of the Bible which refers to the *beginnings* of things upon the globe is differently understood since we have studied it by the light

which we have gained from modern science. Likewise, that part which refers to the *last* things, such as resurrection, judgment, and retribution, may be deemed capable of more correct interpretation, as study continues, and the helps of study are improved.

I.

Now, the traditional opinion that Matthew xxv. 31–46 is a prophetic picture of "the Last Judgment," in the sense above described, is challenged by the discovery, and that not a very recent one, that the words rendered in our Bibles, "all nations," will not fairly bear the sense of "all mankind."

The word rendered "nations" (ἔθνη, *ethnē*) occurs in the New Testament a little less than one hundred and fifty times. In about eighty instances it is rendered "Gentiles," in five, "heathen," and elsewhere "nations." Joined, as it is in this passage, with the article "the" (τὰ ἔθνη, *ta ethnē*), carelessly omitted here by our translators, it makes the term regularly used to distinguish the *Gentile* from the Jewish part of the world as "the nations." Our translators would only have adhered to the

regular use of the term, if they had rendered it thus: "Before him shall be gathered all the Gentiles." Why did they not? Because they thought that the subject before them was the general judgment of all mankind at the end of time. So they said "nations," because "nations" suits that idea, and "Gentiles" does not. So, then, when we read "all nations," we get not only a translation, but our translators' *doctrine* of the last judgment, disguised under a translation that is open to question.

The ground on which this translation must be questioned, and the doctrine disguised under it must be doubted, may be more fully stated as follows: —

The Gospel according to Matthew is admitted to have been written expressly for readers of Jewish birth. It was written originally in Hebrew, and this, done over into Greek with some variations, is what we call "Matthew." Now, in the mind of a Jew, or in the pages of a book written for Jews, the term, *ta ethnē* ("the nations"), which our English Bibles here give as "nations," never meant anything but "*the Gentile* nations" outside of the Jewish world. If a Jew wanted to say "all mankind," he

said "Jews *and* nations" (or the nations), as in Romans iii. 29, which reads: "Is God the God of Jews only, and not also God of nations? Yes, of nations also." If he wanted to say "all mankind *except* the Jews," he said "all the nations," as in Romans xv. 11; xvi. 26. Now this is precisely what Jesus, speaking to Jews, and himself a Jew, says here.

The words *panta ta ethnē* (πάντα τὰ ἔθνη), taken simply as Greek words, undoubtedly signify in English *all the nations*. By that *we* understand "all mankind." But *the Jew* did not so understand it. When a Jew used that phrase to Jews, as Christ did to the Apostles in this passage, he meant the *non-Jewish* nations, just as regularly as we, when we speak of "the heathen," mean, in general, the non-Christian nations.

The different sense which two different languages may put into the same *combination* of words, which, *separately*, word by word, have the same sense in both languages, is illustrated by the experience of the American, who, in addressing a Sunday-school in France, was unaware that *eau de vie* (literally "water of life") is the French phrase for *brandy*, and electrified his hear-

ers by gravely assuring them that in heaven there was "a pure river of *eau de vie*." [1]

In this judgment of "all the nations," therefore, unless we think fit to ignore the idiomatic sense which these words always carried from Jewish lips to Jewish ears, we cannot recognize anything but a description of the judgment of the *Gentile* part of mankind, all *except* the Jews. It is as certain as anything which depends on the intelligent interpretation of language can ever be, that this is not the final and universal judgment of the human race that it has been supposed to be.

(1.) This immediately starts the question: What then of the *Jewish* portion of mankind? What of their judgment? This is apparent from a glance at the preceding chapters of Matthew, from the twenty-first onward, recording discourses which were all delivered by Christ on the same day as this — the last day of his public teaching. These contain no less than six *Parables of Judgment*, three of them addressed to the unbelieving part of the nation, and three to the few believers, namely: —

First triplet, addressed to the unbelievers,

[1] He should have said *eau vive*, "living water."

that is, either to the nation generally or to their representatives, as the Pharisees.

a. The Two Sons, xxi. 28–32.

b. The Wicked Husbandmen, xxi. 33–41.

c. The Marriage of the King's Son, xxii. 2–14.

This last, connected as it is with the subject of the Gospel invitation to the Gentile world, sounds a prelude to that subject of the judgment of the Gentiles which concludes the whole series of these parables. For, obviously, the man without "the wedding garment" was one of the outside multitude, to whom the invitation rejected by those that scorned the king was given.

Second triplet, addressed to the believers, the Jewish-Christian Church.

a. The Faithful and the Evil Servant, xxiv. 45–51.

b. The Wise and the Foolish Virgins, xxv. 1–13.

c. The Talents: or the Diligent Servants and the Slothful, xxv. 14–30.

The topic of each of these parables is *judgment* in varied aspects. The twenty-third chapter and most of the twenty-fourth, intervening between the two triplets, is a

continuous thunder-roll of the judgment impending over the people and the city to whom the first triplet was addressed. These six now described, and the one in the passage now before us, which is a prophetic *picture* rather than a parable, must be taken together to make up in combination *a judgment discourse that shall be applicable to Jews and Gentiles both, that is, to all mankind.* Each of these seven will be found to refract one or more of those prismatic rays of truth which are combined in a perfect idea of the judgment of God.

(2.) A second question touches next the *time of the fulfillment* of these judgment warnings. Some of them, at any rate (such as Matt. xxi. 43; xxii. 7), were fulfilled in the lifetime of some who heard them. Judgment fell upon the Jewish people as predicted, their city was destroyed, and a million of them perished in the ruin. This immediate beginning of the fulfillment, so far as the Jews were concerned, leads us to anticipate the like so far as the Gentiles were concerned. If there was no putting off on one side, why should we expect putting off on the other side? We presume that the cases will probably be parallel, no

more delay of judgment in the one than in the other. We must so regard it, unless we find plain evidence to the contrary.

Now, is there any such? Here we shall touch the only difficulty of any account, a difficulty mainly for this reason, that it is harder to get a wrong notion out of our minds than to get a right notion in. The wrong notion, in this case, is due to a wrong way of thinking, to a mechanical, unspiritual way of looking at our Lord's prophecies of great spiritual facts in the unfolding of his kingdom.

The *time* when the judgment of the Gentile part of the world *begins* is said to be "when the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all his [holy] angels with him." This has been generally taken to mean a visible appearance of the Lord Jesus Christ, in the radiance of a glorified body, accompanied with hosts of celestial spirits. This seemed sufficiently consistent with the theory of an assemblage before him of the whole human race in all its countless millions — a grand and final court, to review and adjudicate upon every life that has been lived. No one, indeed, has been able to give a satisfying answer to some questions

which such a theory starts, namely: Why should all these be brought together, some from bliss and some from woe, to hear what they knew already, and to go back into the bliss or woe they came from? Or, why should judgment upon the career of each individual be put off thus to an indefinite future, and then be delivered in a lump, as it were? The usual reply to this, that it is for God's sake, not man's, that this is to be, to the end that his righteousness as a judge may be fully manifested and acknowledged, does not satisfy. For if *men* do not need this concourse before God, if the sinner in utter solitariness may be as thoroughly convinced of God's righteousness and his own sin as in a crowd that includes all mankind, then we may be sure that God needs no such judgment-throng any more than we need it. But the moment it is seen that, according to the very terms of the record, the Jewish portion of mankind are *not counted* in this judgment-concourse before the king, the theory, that here we have a prophecy of the visible appearance of Christ to pass judgment on the collective race, leaks very badly. On the face of the discourse, this is a coming of Christ to only a

part of mankind; the larger part, no doubt, but still *a part only*.

Minds that are not committed to defend any dogma in the teeth of plain facts will make due account of this. This cannot possibly be what it has been supposed to be, a visible coming of Christ to judge *all* mankind at the end of this world's history. The difficulty presented by such a theory visibly melts. So far as that is concerned, there is nothing adverse to our presumption before stated, that the judgment of the Gentile part of the world will run parallel with the judgment of the Jewish part; in fact, that it *began* to be fulfilled immediately, just as that began.

A striking confirmation of this view comes from the picture here drawn of the "brethren of Christ," that is, Christians, as hungry, athirst, naked, sick, and in prison. We cannot misunderstand this allusion to the now well-known circumstances of the church of Christ during her period of conflict, *then about to begin*. We see, indeed, in "these, my brethren," the representatives of needy humanity in all times, in all its piteous appeals for benevolent regard, including the appeals even of those deemed ill-deserving

and justly punished, as the brethren of Christ were, in early days, so generally deemed by most men. Christians are familiar with the wide application, in many a sermon to-day, of this designation, "my brethren," to all who need Christian charity. Only let it be remembered, both to quicken Christian charity, and to sharpen Christian insight into the spiritual understanding of this whole prophecy, that *Christians themselves* were the "destitute, afflicted, tormented" ones, according to their treatment of whom the Gentiles are here described as judged.

We are now able to answer the question: *When* did the judgment of the Gentiles begin?

Premising what many forget, that nothing in God's kingdom comes all at once, but rather by stages of continuous advance — the Son of man came in his glory, that is, *began* to come, when he began to be preached and believed on among the Gentiles as "the Lord of glory," the spiritual king of men; when his name began to be recognized as "above every other name," "the only name under heaven whereby we must be saved." (Acts iv. 12.) With him were "all his an-

gels" (the word "holy" does not belong to the text), — all the miraculous powers and spiritual influences[1] which so marvelously aided the introduction of faith in the Lord of glory among the Gentiles. The Apostles and all missionaries of the gospel are doubtless included among these "angels," or messengers, as the word originally meant.[2] Then did he indeed begin to "sit upon the throne of his glory," a throne immediately erected in every believing heart, and destined to be recognized as established in the world, in proportion as the Christian element grew strong enough to make social usages and civil laws conform more and more to the rule of Christ.

Thus we are bound to understand our Lord's prophecy of his coming by the spiritual aim of all his teachings, which constantly point to things above the region of outward show and mechanical forms. We must here bear in mind the cautionary remark of a spiritual mind like that of Paul, about the "veil on the heart," that veil of

[1] The word "angel," in the Old Testament, is applied both to personal and impersonal agents of God.

[2] The "angels" of the seven churches in John's Revelation are generally supposed to have been men, not celestial spirits.

obstinate, sensuous prepossessions, which blinded Jewish readers to the spiritual import of the prophecies of the kingdom of heaven. Those who insist on a coming of Christ with such accessories of light and sound and form as lie upon the low level of sensuous perception, are simply furnishing powder and shot to skeptics, who say that Jesus promised to come in that way before that generation had passed, and has not come, so that he must be accounted a false prophet.

The idea of a coming of Christ in such form and glory as are apparent to the senses is borrowed from the Jews, who anticipated the coming of the Messiah in that manner. The genuinely Christian idea of his coming views him as coming to the hearts and consciences of men with spiritual power, converting individuals, purifying society, shaping institutions and laws, communicating ideas that expand with power, principles that grow toward sovereignty, a *spirit* that by degrees leavens the world, and at length controls the world, recognizably, that is, *visibly, to our minds*. Such spiritual ascendency is true glory, the highest glory. In such glory the Son of man began to come,

as he said, within the lifetime of some of his hearers. (Matt. xvi. 28.)

II.

To exhibit the harmony of the remainder of the chapter with the view that has now been presented, a running commentary will suffice.

"Before him shall be gathered all nations." (Verse 32.) This began to be fulfilled as all nations began to be brought before him in the world-wide preaching of his Gospel.

"And he shall separate them," etc. This also began to take place as they began to separate themselves to right and left as believers or opposers, "sheep" or "goats." Wherever Christ is preached men *take sides.* This division took place, notably, among those who heard Jesus speak. (John vii. 43.) That this, as stated in our Lord's prophecy, is the first result wherever he comes among men, our Lord's explicit words testify: "Not peace but division." (Luke xii. 51.)

"Then shall the king say unto them," etc. (Verses 34–45.) In this twofold address of the king, I find foreshadowed that

authoritative preaching of the Gospel of the kingdom, which sets forth the law of the kingdom, and pronounces who have part and who have no part therein. Let us not forget that the Gospel of Christ is essentially *a law of life*, announcing the conditions of life. Such a Gospel applies a *test* to its hearers, enabling each to judge on which side of the law of life he stands. The preaching of this Gospel is, primarily, a declaration of *judgment* upon the position which its hearers take; a judgment which each hearer, whose conscience is awake, must needs apply to himself. The two different courses here described as ministering or not ministering to the neediness of the afflicted Christians may be simply generalized as *obedience or disobedience to the Gospel law of love.* (1 John iv. 21.)

The general view here taken may be stated thus: *This judgment-prophecy is designed to include the whole period of the kingdom of Christ, from the beginning of the spread of "the Gospel of the kingdom."* It announces principles of judgment which apply to all duration, in all worlds, as taking effect *now*, in a Divine judgment *beginning* though not ending in this world.

Conformably to what has been said, in the "Come, ye blessed," and "Depart, ye cursed," we shall miss the sense, if we think we hear an irreversible allotment to those who have made an unalterable choice, and taken a final and fixed position forever. I am aware how almost invincible is the prepossession which will deny this, but I am content in stating a fact which candid inquiry, freeing itself from the shackles of ignorance and of blind dogmatism, will ere long freely admit. The language is intense and the description is picturesque, but this well befits the fact that our Lord, as the nations are brought before him, in the preaching of his Gospel, *declares the ultimatum of human destiny as settled by the law of love*. The "Come" and "Depart," instead of expressing the unalterable *conditions of the hearers*, express rather the unalterable issues of the *courses* which the hearers choose: unalterable in *nature*, but *conditioned* upon the hearers' *choice*. "Come" or "Depart," according as you fulfill or resist the bidding of the law of love. It is fixed in the nature of things, as an eternal law, that the loving, the merciful, the unselfish, and only they, can come

into fellowship with the Lord of glory, while the hard, the unpitying, the selfish, can only be parted from him into fellowship with the enemies of mankind, "the devil and his angels." This is in substance equivalent to "He that believeth shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned." (Mark xvi. 16.) As a statement of "the terms of salvation," the passage before us runs in the same line of thought as earlier sayings that Matthew has recorded, such as these: "Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy" (v. 7); "Whosoever shall give to drink unto one of these little ones a cup of cold water only, in the name of a disciple, verily, I say unto you, he shall in no wise lose his reward." (X. 42.)

Let us reflect on this, that wherever this Gospel of the Lord is faithfully preached to-day, he is continually sitting in judgment upon the choices that the hearers make, and continually repeating these judgment words, "Come," "Depart," in the varied forms in which the Gospel pronounces *the Divine ultimatum*, in all the varied phrases by which it declares that spiritual life or death is the issue of the

opposite choices which men make. These words express a finality, because they express what is in the nature of things unchangeable. But it is a finality *which is offered to the election of the hearer still.*

Here we must observe two things. It is, indeed, to those who are ranged on *opposites sides* that the king says "Come," "Depart." But this is the very aspect which the world, so far as evangelized, presents *to-day*, a world in two divisions, on opposite sides of "the law of Christ." And all preaching of the Gospel presupposes the power of voluntary *transition* from side to side. The "Come" and "Depart," therefore, however expressive of the solemn finality of that law of consequences, which demands that "whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap," are very far from *fixing* "a great gulf" between the saved and the lost. He who in the depths of conscience to-day hears the word "Depart," in a feeling of his utter unfitness for the Father's blessing, may yield to the conviction, may honor the law of Christ by a consecration of his life, may cross from the left to the right, among those that are coming to the Lord.

Or, on the other hand, he may persistently refuse to come. What then, but a *going on* in the evil way to the uttermost of evil consequence? "These shall go away into the eternal punishment." They *have been going away*, departing from the Lord and his kingdom, ever since they cast off his law of love. They simply *go on* in their chosen way of departure. It is a way of punishment in the nature of things, that is, eternally, as long as they go on, the more departure the more sin and punishment, though they should go on sinning without end.

Now this is matter of experience in the present world. Men who have been brought before Christ either in the preaching of the Gospel, or as they have seen "the Word made flesh" in some saintly life, hear the "Come" or the "Depart" in their inmost souls to-day, as judgment is pronounced in conscience upon the issues of their life in coming to or departing from the Lord. Not only this, but the experience of these issues, in the peace and blessedness which the loving and self-denying life "inherits," or in the unrest and cankered spirit of the selfish worldling, begins to be realized here.

When we read, therefore, "these shall go away into the eternal punishment, but the righteous into eternal life," we are not to see in picture any final opening and shutting of heaven gates or of hell gates at the adjournment of a universal judgment of mankind. Nor are we to think that this verse marks probation as closed and having given place to retribution. We are to see, rather, *the Gospel ultimatum taking effect in the present experience of every hearer*, according as his choice in the *present moment* places him on the right or the wrong side of "the law of the King." (James ii. 8.)

I am aware that it will take time and thought, aye, and *a more spiritual way of thinking*, to efface the inveterate impression of the Christian world on this subject, so as to dispel the traditional illusion that Christ terms punishment and life "eternal," because measured by a sort of infinite almanac or clock. Rather is it the *nature* of things, independently of any *measure* of time or quantity, which makes the punishment and the life "eternal." Just as hardness of heart eternally, that is, in the timeless and unchangeable nature of things,

results from acts of selfishness, without regard to clock or almanac, with equal inevitableness after one year or a million years, so is "the eternal punishment" that which the spiritual *nature*, not duration, brings upon the violators of the eternal law in this world and in all the worlds of God. It may begin in any time or any place; it may end in any time or place; but it is nothing connected with beginning or ending, nor any *relation* to time or place, that constitutes it "eternal," but simply its *nature*, *as the invariable result of law*. Repentance and conversion may cut it short in a day; but it is "eternal" all the same. It may cease to exist, but it ceases only when *the cause* ceases to exist from whose existence it must eternally follow.

So, also, "the eternal life" is not a certain *measure* of existence, but a certain *kind* of existence; that kind which results in the timeless and unchangeable nature of things, that is, eternally, from the specific causes mentioned by our Lord in John xvii. 3. This also begins, as Christ and his Apostles explicitly declare, in the present world. (John iii. 36; 1 John v. 11, etc.)

III.

The grand lesson of this judgment prophecy is now before us. *Judgment begins here*, though it does not end here. Nay, "after death judgment" (not "*the* judgment" — Heb. ix. 27), as well as before death, but so much *more completely developed*, that we may speak with a deep spiritual significance of "the world of judgment," not forgetting, however, that this world, and any world, is *a world of judgment so far as it is a world of law*. Judgment is simply the experience and manifestation of the consequences of keeping or breaking law. It takes time to manifest *all* the consequences, time that outreaches the present world. But the manifestation of these consequences exists in one stage of development or another, wherever law exists. This world is a world where judgment goes on to-day according to the law of Christ the King. The system of things is not double, all probation here and all judgment there, but single, probation and judgment combined in one system of things, from the time that man begins to be capable until he ceases to be capable (if he ever ceases) of choosing whether he will obey or disobey the law of God.

What then becomes of the doctrine of "the last judgment" in the light of this exposition? It is not abolished. It is transformed. A lot of useless stage machinery is put away. A spiritual reality is made manifest. Like other Christian doctrines, the doctrine of the last judgment must *lose* its grosser form, to *live* in purer and truer form. In a very true and solemn sense we see in this passage *the last* judgment. It is recorded at the close of the narrative of our Lord's public teaching, as *his ultimatum to the world*, his final and conclusive judgment upon the two courses that the hearers of his Gospel elect — his last and great word of destiny. But it is not pronounced after probation has ended; while probation is in progress, rather, while the Gospel invitation is open, while a Saul may change to a Paul. In its presentation of the two unchangeable alternatives for our choice, it falls upon our ears with solemnity as the final word, *the last judgment that can ever express our relation to the eternal law.*

To me, and I hope to others, thinking in this way, an increased solemnity is imparted to the present life, the present hour,

as the *beginning* of that spiritual judgment before the Lord, through whose uttermost processes each one must pass, until all that is sown in the present shall be reaped in the present and the future. (2 Cor. v. 10.) That welcome "Come," that dread "Depart," are not to be heard from a vast remoteness, but as if spoken in our ears: the present decision must be made in mindfulness of the immeasurable potency of the good or the evil germ to develop itself blissfully or wofully. The mediæval notion of a fiery hell-dungeon, peopled with devilish tormentors, and the twin chimera of a heavenly colosseum, peopled with the singers of an endless concert of praise, have both given place to conceptions of the future more rational and true. But though the imaginative *forms*, in which the truth was rudely clothed for a while, have been discarded, the *substance* of the truth is with us still. Judgment, reward, and punishment, both through the present and in the future, abide as living truths, which experience and reflection imbed ever more deeply in the convictions of thoughtful minds.

As men study the actual phenomena of human life the more convinced are they

that retribution is not something that stands adjourned to eternity. It begins *here*, if it ever begins, at least in inward fact, if not in outward demonstration. And as men study the phenomena of character, the formation of habits and tempers, of principles and dispositions, the more convinced are they that the judgment most to be dreaded and hardest to escape in any world where the law holds that "whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap," is *a character* set wrong by skeptical habits and selfish principles, settling into wrong by indifference to truth, by contempt of duty, in a reckless and selfish use of the present hour. Such a character is seen to carry in itself evidently developing germs of evil, whose development has all the future to mature in, and whose very nature is to demoralize and destroy. The full unfolding of these in a spiritual world, where every screen of flesh and blood is dropped, where each goes "to his own place" (Acts i. 25) and to his own sort, according to what he is, in spirit and tendency, may fully justify the impression which the general tone of the New Testament makes upon us, that this life of ours may be abused to conse-

quences which are past remedy. It may prove — there is great reason to think so — a spreading cancer in our spiritual nature, whose burning is inextinguishable, everlasting, till the ruin is complete in the extinction of personal existence itself, fulfilling thus the sternest warning our Saviour ever uttered, in actually destroying both soul and body in hell. (Matt. x. 28.)

From the view which has been taken in this and in the foregoing chapter, the conclusion is unavoidable, that the popular doctrine of the day of judgment has been read *into* the Scripture, and not read *out* of it. In Scripture we find no warrant for looking forward to a judgment to be delivered to mankind in a mass, and to be displayed after the manner of the *Dies Iræ*,

> "When, shriveling like a parched scroll,
> The flaming heavens together roll,
> And louder yet, and yet more dread,
> Swells the high trump that wakes the dead."

There are days of judgment, days of the Lord, in the Old Testament sense (Isaiah xiii. 6), like the day when Babylon was judged. The fall of the Roman Empire, the French Revolution of 1792, the Ameri-

can Civil War, were such days. Beside these particular days, there is a general day of judgment. In such a day, or period, we now are living. The law delivered by Christ is being manifestly executed in the experience both of society and of individuals. Beyond the grave there is further judgment, when the evil that has escaped full disclosure and condemnation in a world of fleshly forms will no more escape, where we are to see as we are seen and to know as we are known, where everything that has been veiled in the body must be manifested in the spirit. So searching, so complete, may such judgment be anticipated to be, that we may speak of it, in that sense, as *the* judgment. But to this we go, each of us alone, at death. Not in a mass, but one by one, are we to be confronted with it in the still court of conscience, ablaze at last with the unobstructed light of the Most Holy. For this there is no waiting of long ages. As soon as we enter the unseen world, our judgment is immediate, at least in its *beginning*.

So far, then, as resurrection be regarded as antecedent to judgment, there is no more delay of the former than of the lat-

ter. The immediateness of judgment after death implies the immediateness of what Christ calls "*the resurrection of judgment.*" (John v. 29.)

CHAPTER VIII.

PARTICULARS ELUCIDATED BY PRINCIPLES.

"The Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel and the trump of God, and the dead in Christ shall rise first. Then we who are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord." — 1 *Thess.* iv. 16, 17.

I. So far as we have studied the subject of the resurrection in the teachings of Christ and of Paul, we have seen reason to think: —

(1.) That it is not reserved till the end of time, but is now taking place in the unseen world, through the continuously acting operation of the spiritual power which was manifest in him who said, "I AM the Resurrection and the Life."

(2.) That there is a wide difference between such resurrection as mere nature brings to pass, through neglect of effort for spiritual culture, and such as results from the Christian endeavor which Paul described, when he said that he made all sac-

rifices, "if by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead." (Phil. iii. 10, 11.) This is what Christ calls the "resurrection of life," in the full harvest of spiritual endeavors; the other is what he calls the "resurrection of judgment," in life that is not *life*, an existence in privation and loss, destitute of all the spiritual fruits for which no seed was sown.[1]

(3.) The resurrection, whether "of life" or "of judgment," is not a single simultaneous event, affecting all the dead at the same moment, but the continuous process of the rising of spirits, "every man in his own order," into that condition of existence in spiritual bodies which they are fitted to rise into.

(4.) This condition, whatever it be, involves such a conscious experience of the spiritual results of the present life as will perfectly declare the divine judgment upon "the deeds done in the body."

(5.) There is no middle state of waiting to be refurnished, at some great distant day, with a body, all men at once, and in those bodies standing all together before the throne of God to receive judgment in

[1] See note B, appended to chapter iv.

a mass, but onward movement ever, without arrest or halt, both in embodied life, and under law, and in the judgment consequences of uninterrupted law; as what we already know of the works and ways of God requires us to believe.

These ideas appear to be expressed in a few great sayings of Christ, and to be repeated in substance by Paul.

II. But difficulties start up when we attempt to harmonize with these leading ideas some particular statements which we find chiefly in the writings of Paul. Such a statement occurs in his first letter to the Corinthians (xv. 51, 52):[1] "We shall all be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump, for the trumpet shall sound and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed." Another such statement is made in that ex-

[1] The true reading in the original is very doubtful. The best reading is probably not that of our version. The "we" refers to those who shall be living on the earth at the end. *Of these* the Apostle probably said, "none of us (who are then living on the earth) will die, but all of us will be changed." So verse 52 says, the trumpet shall sound, and the dead (all but those then on the earth) shall be raised, and we (all then on earth) shall be changed. This admits the possibility of an interval of time between the "trumpet" and the change.

tract from Paul's first letter to the Thessalonians which is prefixed to this chapter.

On such passages, and on others that have already been examined, the traditional conception of the resurrection rests, which even now is closely patterned after the belief of the Jews before Christ. The Jews believed that the Christ was to come in visible glory, and that the dead, when he came, were to be raised up in new bodies. The Apostles undoubtedly inherited this belief, and never parted with it. It was one of their ruling ideas, shaping their mode of thought and coloring their language. There is profound truth in it underlying the picturesque description we are familiar with. But an error has overlaid the truth. What should be regarded as purely symbolic and suggestive has been taken as literal and representative. Thoroughly Jewish, mechanical and unspiritual is the current representation, stereotyped in the creeds and in the hymns, of a momentary event, a supernatural display, a divine form of glory, a world-awakening reveille, followed instantly by the simultaneous rising of the dead out of the dust and out of the sea; the reclothing, in the twinkling of

an eye, of every disembodied spirit with a new body, the transformation of the world of living men at once into spiritual conditions, the massing of all the risen and all the changed multitudes about the judgment throne, while the heavens and the earth melt in a fiery catastrophe, —

> "Dies iræ, dies illa,
> Solvens sæclum in favilla."

Not only mediæval and rude, but thoroughly Jewish and fictitious as this conception is, it is time that Christian people discarded it, time that our hymn-books were purged of it; time that what is true in it were separated from what is not true.

One of the most noteworthy phenomena that have recently occurred in the Christian world was the convention that assembled in New York city, toward the close of the year 1878, in the interest of one of these superannuated and obsolescent Jewish fictions, — the advent of Christ in visible form and in display to the senses. Including, as it did, some of the ablest preachers in the several Protestant communions, the result which this convention achieved, through the wide currency which the metropolitan journals gave to its elaborate dis-

cussions, was the most noteworthy thing about it. That result was the incredulity and apathy with which the Christian public generally received the theories of the convention. This seems to demonstrate that the church is emerging from the mediæval and Jewish way of thinking about the coming of the Lord, and about the resurrection and judgment associated in the Scriptures with it. Few care for the millenarian theories, because few are content with the materialistic way of thinking that is common to them all. Christian thought, however undefined, demands a more spiritual presentation of the doctrine of the Lord's coming. In these misconceived prophecies the profoundest truths lie, still waiting their time to be reformulated. To contribute somewhat toward such a result, as a labor in which many must coöperate, is our present endeavor.

III. Now how shall we get at such a result? There are two methods.

One may tell people *what* to think, what interpretation to attach to the Scripture texts. Or,

One may show people *how* to think, what principles to apply to bring out the truth

which is wrapped in the imaginative language of the Scriptures.

(1.) This latter seems the better method. It not only gives the true result, but gives reasonable confidence that the result is the true one, because one sees that the true way has been followed.

In following this method, which shows us *how* to think upon this subject, we have to apply these two principles to the interpretation of Scripture teaching.

(*a.*) *The facts* which a prophet (like Paul) reports to us are one thing; *his views* of them, or opinions about them, are another. We accept the former, we do not always accept the latter.

Through the glass of revelation the prophet sees the salient facts of the future, as one sees far off the summits of a mountain chain. They lie in apparent connection with each other, projected against the blank sky like the teeth of a gigantic saw. But the traveler, on coming to the mountain chain, finds the peaks draw apart. Between those which from afar appeared close together he finds wide valleys and broad plateaus intervening, of which the distant view gave no suggestion. Thus we

may find the testimony of prophecy supplemented and qualified by that of experience. Paul describes great facts of the future as he sees them standing forth, one next another. Facts which experience will show separated by a wide interval of progress, as the coming of the Lord in his kingdom, and the change of those on earth to meet the Lord in the air, he states in the same breath, just as his prophetic vision discerned them. Very likely he may have thought them close together in one point of time. But nothing depends on what he *thought*. Paul's personal opinions about the facts of which he testified bind no man's judgment. Peter, himself also a prophet of the future, tells us that the divine realities are larger than any man's thought about them. "No prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation." (2, i. 20.) The contents of prophecy are not measured by the minds of the prophets. The prophet's private opinion, however manifest it be, is not to be confounded with his official testimony. This is the New Testament doctrine, as in 1 Peter i. 10–12, where it is said that the prophets did not always comprehend their

own testimony. Our conclusions, therefore, while controlled by Paul's prophetic report of certain facts, will not be controlled by Paul's opinions respecting those facts. We shall exercise our liberty to think upon those facts in the light of *our* times as well as in the light of his.

Few persons who study this subject carefully will judge that the Apostles correctly understood the relation and connection of the facts in the future which they prophesied. Certain as those facts were, the opinions of the Apostles concerning them were not always correct. This is demonstrable to a certainty. It is a law of the human mind, that our understanding of any new fact is regulated and shaped by the ideas already in our minds. This was illustrated by the German peasant, who saw for the first time a locomotive speeding along. After an earnest gaze, endeavoring to comprehend the secret of its motion, he at last ejaculated, "*Es mussen Pferde darin seyn* (there must be horses inside)." The new phenomenon he explained by one of his established beliefs, namely, that a wheeled vehicle in motion must be connected with horses. If not outside they must be inside.

Now it is demonstrable to any one who traces the history of Jewish thought upon the doctrine of the Messiah's coming, that the Apostles' minds were dominated by an established belief, which unfitted them for truly *interpreting*, as distinct from *reporting*, our Lord's prophecies of his coming. This belief was, that, in the nearness of the Messiah's advent, the career of human institutions and governments was near its end. The world was "growing old." The empires of the Gentiles had had their day. "The end of all things," said Peter (1, iv. 7), "is at hand." A grand catastrophe, not a grand development, was impending. No new empires, no new civilization, no new continent beyond the sea, no age-long progress of a spiritual kingdom "growing from within outward" (as the philosophic church historian Neander so frequently describes it), — but a "descent" of the Lord "from heaven in flaming fire," wherein "all these things shall be dissolved"[1] — an event to be daily expected. Such a mode of thought, developed by the apocalyptic literature[2] which had saturated the Jewish church for two hundred years,

[1] See note D, appended to this chapter.

[2] As in the "Book of Enoch," quoted by Jude (14, 15).

does not give way at once. It can be transformed only by *experience*. Yet such was the prevailing mode of thought in the minds through which our Lord's prophecies of the future have been transmitted to us. We should naturally expect such a mode of thought to give its peculiar color, as it has, to the Apostles' testimony of the things to come. Those things were, indeed, as the Apostles testified, "at the doors," only not *in such manner* as they expected.

"The end of the world" was at hand, but it was the end of the *Jewish* "world," or "age," — the end, not of the physical but of the spiritual course of things then current, the end of the period preparatory to the manifestation of the Christ, the spiritual king of the world. The Son of man was about to come in his kingdom ("before this generation shall pass," said he), but not in any display of wonders to the senses. The resurrection period was near, but no such general and simultaneous resurrection as some of the Apostolic sayings seem to intimate.[1]

[1] Some advance in thought is discernible in the later as compared with the earlier writings of Paul. We are not to suppose that he gained at once all the light he ever had. What he says to the Thessalonians about the resurrection must be supplemented, perhaps qualified, by what he says later to the Corinthians.

A judgment period, too, was near, but no such general and final judgment as was probably fancied. Instead of a final catastrophe, a final stage of progress was about to open. The facts were about to take place, not as brief convulsive *events*, but in the gradual unfolding of a vast and age-long *development*.

(*b.*) The other principle to be always applied to the interpretation of the Scripture teachings is this: —

Spiritual *truths* must be discriminated from the material *forms* and fleshly drapery in which they are pictured. We are familiar with this principle, but we need to be more consistent in its application. We have learned to apply it to the Old Testament descriptions of GOD. We read of God's hands and feet, his eyes and ears, his arms and wings, his nostrils and mouth, and even of his fury, jealousy and warlikeness. We speak in the same fashion. We distinguish between the spiritual reality and the fleshly form of representation. By God's "hand" we refer to his power, by his "eyes" to his cognizance, by his "mouth" to his revelations. It makes no difference to us what ideas the Hebrews

may have attached to these fleshly words; we attach our own ideas to them. We think it possible that even the inspired prophet of twenty-five hundred years ago may have attached to such words an idea of the Infinite Sovereign less true than ours.

Now consistency requires that this discrimination between the spiritual reality and the material form should be carried into the New Testament, and into such subjects as the resurrection and the judgment and the coming of the Lord to judge and to reign. We make some such discrimination already, as in reading John's Revelation, where few thoughtful people understand that God has a city in cubical form, with real walls of precious stones and gates of pearls and a street of gold. But we must carry this discrimination consistently through the whole range of thought in which *spiritual conceptions have been translated*, for the help of infantile or immature thought, *into material terms*. We must, in our thinking, *translate them back again*, so far as we have the spiritual discernment to do it, and power to grasp an *idea* apart from its conventional *symbol*.

It must certainly be admitted that the traditional notion of a great catastrophic day at the end of Time's calendar, on which the Christ descends in fiery clouds, archangels fly to and fro blowing trumpets, and a police of celestial marshals gathers the million million suddenly roused occupants of graves around a great white throne, to hear divine lips utter words which doom them to the prison of the damned, or welcome them to the city of God, is as unlike the spiritual reality as is the Hebrew picture of a Deity with arms and wings enthroned on the vertex of the blue arch of sky, or careering along in a chariot of clouds.

And yet, let us not forget, while it is only a picture, *a fleshly and thoroughly material symbol of a spiritual reality*, yet it is a grand and awful picture, the grandest ever drawn by man. The reality behind the symbol is certainly no less grand and awful.

The two principles now laid down show us *how* to think toward a true understanding of the Scripture teachings about the future. We are to discriminate (1.) the *facts* of the prophetic testimony from the *opinions* of the prophetic witnesses; and

(2.) the spiritual *realities* from the material *symbols* and *forms* in which they are conveyed.

(2.) When we thus see *how* to think, the remainder of our inquiry is *what* to think; what results shall we come to in the application of these principles?

Taking the statements of Paul in combination, we find positive testimony to certain facts. These facts, however, depend not on Paul's testimony only. Christ is the principal witness for most of them. By comparing what Paul says with what Christ says we are able to distinguish between the fact which Paul affirms and the opinion about it which appears in Paul's language.

(*a.*) The first fact is *the coming of the Lord*—"the Lord shall descend." The Lord did come, as he foretold, before the generation which heard him speak had passed away. His prophecy was fulfilled when Moses' seat, as law-giver and judge in the religious world, was removed by the destruction of the temple, and was replaced by the throne of Christ, as the manifest head of the kingdom of God upon earth. This has been explained at length in a preceding chapter. As to the manner in

which Paul expected the Lord to come, his substituting "descend" for "come" looks as though he thought of a coming down *upon* the world, rather than of a spiritual development *within* the world. An external coming, a *descent* within the sphere of the senses, was certainly what his Jewish training predisposed him to think of.

(*b.*) Closely combined with the coming of the Lord is the attendant *ministry of angels* — "with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God." The core of this statement is furnished by the sayings of Christ (Matt. xxiv. 31; xxv. 31), but in Paul's writings this core of fact is overlaid with Paul's opinions as to who these "angels of the Son of man" should be. I think that Christ used the term "angels" in the comprehensive sense in which the Old Testament makes it include impersonal as well as personal agents of God. Thus we find it in the 104th Psalm: "He maketh the winds his messengers, the lightnings his ministers." Used in this comprehensive way, the term would include all agents whatsoever in the service of the kingdom, besides apostles, missionaries, and the "ministering spirits" (Heb. i. 14) who

are beyond our sight. But Paul seems to have thought exclusively of celestial beings, for he substitutes "archangel" for the simple and comprehensive term "angels," which Christ had used. Here, then, while accepting the fact of an attendant ministry of angels at the coming of the Lord, we must revise Paul's opinion about it. There *are* angels, no doubt, intelligent beings of higher rank than ours, but these are not the only angels in the service of the kingdom. The angelic trumpet-call which our Lord foretold took place in that apostolic preaching of the Gospel of the resurrection, of which an echo still reverberates in Paul's quotation to the Ephesians: "Awake, thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light." (V. 14.) Whatever evidence has been displayed to show that our Lord's prophecies of his coming have already entered upon their course of fulfillment, so much reason we have to bind us to this understanding of the part that "angels" bear.

(*c.*) The third fact is *the resurrection* — "the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible:" — "the dead in Christ shall rise first." This is not all,

but this is *first.* The sounding of the Gospel trumpet through this world, as explained in the preceding paragraph, is followed by resurrection in the next world, that is, *the* resurrection, the resurrection of life, as explained in chapter iv. In other words, *the period of the Gospel here has corresponding to it the period of resurrection there.* Manifestly; since the Gospel brings men under the spiritual power of him who is the Resurrection and the Life, so that they strive, as Paul strove, to "attain unto the resurrection," this will be followed by the appropriate spiritual results in their rising from the dead. Corresponding to this period of Gospel influence and Christian endeavor, there must be a period of attainment and realization of the fruits thereof. This is the resurrection "at" the coming of the Lord,[1] not a single, explosive, simultaneous event, but a continuous process throughout the whole period of his coming and presence ("*parousia*," see p. 124) — the rising of those who are prepared *into* that *for* which they are prepared.

(*d.*) The last fact mentioned by Paul is a final change to pass upon all such as are

[1] See note C, appended to chapter v.

living, at the last, upon the earth. "All of us shall be changed." (See note on p. 189.) "We who are alive and remain shall be caught up in the clouds." Paul's earlier idea of the resurrection (see p. 197, note) was apparently that of a single and simultaneous event, with a change of the living immediately after. Revising his opinion, and regarding the resurrection as continuing through a period, the question rises: *After this period, what?* Paul says, a "*last* trump," a final summons of some sort, not the same as the previous resurrection call, as this epithet "last" seems to imply, and *then* a change of those still living on the earth.

As to this, whether we regard the opinions of some of the Greek philosophers,[1] which Paul may not have been ignorant of, or the opinion of modern scientists, or whether we regard Paul as speaking by revelation, as he says he does ("by the word of the Lord"), the conclusion is the same. The Gospel period on earth, the

[1] Heraclitus in the 6th century B. C., and Zeno in the 3d (the latter the founder of the Stoics whom Paul encountered at Athens), taught a doctrine of the periodic formation and annihilation of the material universe. All things, as Heraclitus held, originate out of "fire," and ultimately return to it.

resurrection period in the unseen world, will sometime terminate. The existing course and order of things are not permanent. Thóugh we may still be far distant from the end of human development on earth, yet the end will come. Some of the prophets of science tell us that the globe will sometime become what the moon is, a planet without water, without an atmosphere, incapable of sustaining the life it now sustains. This condition, indeed, they set at an immense distance from the present. Whether the change of the living that Paul speaks of be long anterior to this; whether it is to be both instantaneous and simultaneous, or in some gradual and progressive manner; whether the suddenness and brevity expressed by the phrase, "in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye," be true only of its *beginning*, as a *process*, or of its *beginning and ending*, as a momentary event, are questions which only the future can answer. The naked fact, however, stands.

A change of some sort, in some manner, awaits the present condition, both of the earth, and of the life that has been adapted to it as at present. At this "end," we are

told that the Gospel period is to reach its earthly end.

Of this end of the Gospel period on earth Paul seems to have prophesied in the grandest, but in some respects most mysterious, of all his predictions; for some remarks on which see chapter ix. note D.

"Then *cometh* the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power.

"For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet.

"The last enemy *that* shall be destroyed *is* death.

"For he hath put all things under his feet. But when he saith all things are put under *him*, *it is* manifest that he is excepted, which did put all things under him.

"And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all." (1 Cor. xv. 24–28.)

Our endeavor in the present chapter has been to discover, if we may, under an ap-

parent dissonance, a real harmony between the previous results of our study, as stated at the beginning of this chapter, and certain prophecies of Paul upon the resurrection at the coming of the Lord. Our recognition of any such harmony depends upon the influence upon our way of thinking, which we allow to the two cardinal principles already laid down, namely, the discrimination of the prophet's testimony to facts from the prophet's personal opinions about them, which we discover blending with his testimony; — then, the discrimination of the spiritual fact itself from the fleshly drapery under which it is represented.

IV. It now remains to ask, What is the substantial truth conveyed to us by those specific prophecies of the resurrection which we have been examining? It seems to be this: —

The coming of our Lord in his kingdom on earth, when Judaism was supplanted by Christianity, ushered in the resurrection period in the world to come. I do not say, began the *resurrection*, as if there had been no resurrection before. Of this more will be said presently. I say rather, began *the period* whose distinguishing characteristic

is the *manifested power* of the resurrection, "the Resurrection of life." In a broader statement, *the Christian period is characteristically the period of spiritual life, exalted and diffused, and this* IN BOTH WORLDS. Our Lord seems to have intimated this when he said: "I am come that they might have *life*, and that they might have it *more abundantly*." (John x. 10.)

(1.) To comprehend this, let us reflect that as the Gospel spreads, and Christian principles acquire ascendency, the glory of our Lord is manifested more and more as Spiritual King on earth, and as the power inwardly working here toward the resurrection hereafter. As faith and love and righteousness and fidelity to Christ here inspire greater numbers with the spirit of the life eternal, so must greater numbers pass into the unseen world fitted to rise in Christ into the fullness of life, into what Paul calls "the manifestation of the sons of God," "after the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ." That is to say, the greater the spiritual development *before* death, the greater the spiritual development *after* death. The period of the one must *coincide* with the period of the other,

for continuity of progress marks all the working of God that we can see. This is what is meant by saying, that the beginning of the Gospel period, when the Son of man came in his kingdom, marked the beginning of the resurrection period corresponding thereto.

(2.) We may rest confidently in this conclusion, not on the score of any skill in interpreting the original language in which the facts were uttered, but through *confidence in the principles* which guide our thinking. The critical question is not, What does this or that Greek word mean? but this rather: *How shall we think* upon the great facts of the kingdom of the Spirit? Shall we cling to the Jewish notion of an advent, within the sphere of the senses, which the Apostles inherited and never outgrew? Shall we limit ourselves by *all* the opinions of the Apostles, as if Christian experience had given us no new light in new developments of the kingdom of Christ? Shall we *materialize* the New Testament prophecies of resurrection and judgment, as the Jews materialized the Old Testament prophecies of the kingdom of God upon earth? Shall we ignore all

that men have discovered of the universality of law and the continuity of progress in the works of God? If so, let us be consistent. Let us continue to believe, with all the ancient creeds, in "the resurrection of the flesh," and the reanimation of the buried and scattered dust into "the self-same bodies." But if this is beyond our present power of belief, let us be *consistent*, and make thorough work, till all the rubbish of Jewish and materialistic and mechanical notions has been cleared away, and this grand doctrine, after waiting nineteen centuries for intelligent elaboration, is unfolded in the lucid order of Christian and spiritual conceptions.

Whoever endeavors to strike a just balance between the traditional view of the resurrection, and that which has been presented in these pages as a substitute for it, has one crucial question to settle. Is the resurrection represented in Scripture as a single and simultaneous *event*, affecting all mankind at once, such as a universal earthquake would be? It cannot be, if we admit the testimony of John to "the *first* resurrection" (of which more will be said in the next chapter), or if we admit the testi-

mony of Paul, "every man in his own order." Is it then a *process*, running through a *period*, and operated by a continuously acting *spiritual power?* It must be, if Christ's resurrection power be not exceptionally different from all the other powers which he claimed as present activities by his significant "I AM." Now as soon as one substitutes for the idea of an *event* the idea of a continuous *process* operated by a continuous power, it will be found that various perplexing passages of Scripture are readily harmonized with this idea by applying the principles of thought that have been followed in the foregoing pages.

V. Brief answers may now be given to a few remaining questions.

(1.) Did not our Lord repeatedly say that he would raise up the believer "at the last day?" (John vi. 39, 40, 44, 54) and does not "at" refer to an *event*, rather than to the period of a process?

The word our Lord used, *en* (ἐν), may mean either *at* or *in*. The idea we have of "the last day" decides which of these two meanings we will adopt. If we think of "the last day" as an *event*, like the day of Pentecost, we shall say "at." If we think

of it as a *period*, through which a process is continuing, we shall say "in." The original word allows an even choice, which depends wholly on our idea of the "day." Our translators had the idea of an *event*, and preferred to say "at." I have the idea of a *period*, and prefer to say "in." By "the last day" it is altogether probable that our Lord meant no end of the earth's calendar, like a 31st of December, but a day of centuries or ages, like one of the six days of creation. It denotes the *last period* of human progress under divine revelation, the day or period of our Lord's manifested kingly power on earth, and of the coincident manifestation of his resurrection power in the unseen world. If this be so, as I see no reason to doubt, we may believe that his promise is now receiving its fulfillment in the present experience of those who "depart to be with Christ." [1]

(2.) But is not the resurrection still a thing of the future rather than of the present? Is it not written that "the dead *shall be* raised"? It certainly is future to all to whom death is future. "The living" (as we call ourselves in a merely phenomenal

[1] See Note C, appended to chapter v.

distinction from "the dead") must ever speak of it as a thing that shall be. But what a thing is *to us* does not define what it is to those who have gone before us, and are no more among us. Speaking of them, we find that Christ in talking with the Sadducees does not say "the dead shall be raised," but "*are* raised," or "rise." (See page 49.) In the world of those whom we call "the dead" the resurrection is no more future, as to us, but a present reality.

(3.) Must we think of all the dead during the ages before Christ as waiting for the resurrection, until Christ came among the living to say, "I AM the Resurrection?" Not so. The Gospel period has been shown to have in the nature of things a resurrection period coincident with it; but this does not imply that there was no resurrection before the Gospel. When Christ affirms that "the dead *are raised*," he instances Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.[1]

A parallel case may serve for illustration. John, speaking of Jesus' lifetime, says that "the Holy Ghost was not yet given." (VII. 39.) He does not mean to deny that the Holy Ghost had been given

[1] See Note A, appended to this chapter.

to the ancient prophets; he means not given, as afterward at Pentecost, *in general diffusion* among the "people prepared for the Lord." The Old Testament reveals the Spirit of God as operating with increasing power from first to last. But in the earlier times the Spirit appeared *limited* to here and there "a man of God," an Enoch, an Abraham, a Moses. The period of the Spirit's *diffusion* began with the diffusion of the Gospel of the resurrection.

Thus we must think of the resurrection, not as *beginning* when the Gospel of the resurrection began, but as *manifested and diffused* when the Gospel was diffused. An experience of the earliest ages for as many as were spiritually fitted for it, it must have become more frequent as spiritual men became more frequent. And when at length the Gospel of the resurrection began to be proclaimed and obeyed, the period of its manifestation and prevalence must have set in. Moses and Elijah, whose glorified forms appeared in society with Jesus on the Transfiguration Mount, attest that it is not *time*, before Christ or after him, which determines men's experience of "the power of his resurrection," but spiritual *fitness* to rise into

the inheritance of the children of God, personal capacity for the power and blessedness and glory of the life eternal.

Here we may utter to one another a word of comfort and hope. The life that follows Christ on earth, the life that rises from the dead in "the power of his resurrection," is *one continuous and unbroken life.* The sleep of the grave is but a figure of speech. The crowded waiting-room of an intermediate state, anticipating a grand and general opening of heavenly gates, is a mere illusion. The dreaded "shadow of death" is attenuated to a thread of shade, where only a gated archway spans the road, to mark the boundary between two worlds. That road is light, on this side the archway and on that. The passage of the shadow is only the passage of the gate from light to light. No pause, no break is there in the spirit's experience of the power of Christ to guide, to nourish, to deliver, to raise through grace to glory. On earth and in heaven the Christly life is *one*, indissoluble, eternal. If our feet are on the king's highway, if the Spirit of the Lord is "the soul of the soul," then, though a cloud may rest on the hori-

zon of our mortal prospect, it is a cloud in whose bosom glory dwells, for we may say with Paul, "He hath abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel." (2 Tim. i. 10.)

NOTE A.

ON RESURRECTION PRIOR TO CHRIST.

But now is Christ risen from the dead, *and* become the first-fruits of them that slept. (1 Cor. xv. 20.)

The statement above made that there must have been resurrection prior to Christ for as many as were capacitated for it (Abraham and Moses for instance), may seem to some to need reconciliation with the statement, so frequently made in the New Testament, that Christ is "the first-fruits of them that slept" (1 Cor. xv. 20, 23), "the first born," or "first begotten from the dead." (Col. i. 18; Rev. i. 5.) To see how this is perfectly consistent with the fact of resurrection prior to Christ, we have only to apply the distinction already pointed out (page 61) between the language of appearance and the language of reality. Christ first *manifested* the resurrection, first walked among men in the *spiritual body* (which distinguishes the resurrection of Christ from the *reanimation*[1] of Lazarus and others). He thus made himself, *relatively to our knowledge*, the beginning, or "first-fruits" of the resurrection, that is,

[1] See chapter iii. Note B.

of the rising after death into blessed life in the spiritual body.

This does not conflict with the fact that it was in the spiritual body of the resurrection state that Moses and Elijah, previous to Christ's resurrection, were seen with Jesus upon the Transfiguration Mountain. From such a manifestation nothing certain could have been known; questions whether they were phantoms, or something more substantial, could never have been answered; the mystery of the future life remained as inscrutable as ever, until Christ should clear it up. This he did by the experiences which he granted to the "witnesses chosen of God, who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead." (Acts x. 41.) The beginning of our *positive knowledge* of the resurrection life in the spiritual body is therefore found in Christ. *So far as we know anything of it*, Christ is "the first-fruits." This, however, by no means makes it improbable that the reality *existed*, before it was *demonstrated*.

NOTE B.

ON THE DOCTRINE OF A PAST RESURRECTION.

Who concerning the truth have erred, saying that the resurrection is past[1] already; and overthrow the faith of some. (2 Tim. ii. 18.)

As distinct from the heresy here condemned, the view presented in these pages is, that the resurrection is as to its *beginning* past, as to its *continuance* present, and as to its *consummation* future.

[1] More literally, "is already come to pass."

The doctrine which Paul here censures was probably one of the earlier developments of the Gnostic heresy, which in the next century became so widely spread. Paul had described the state of believers in Christ as a new and higher life, and had compared it to Christ's resurrection life (Rom. vi. 4), nay, had spoken of it as a kind of resurrection (Eph. ii. 6; especially, v. 14). Probably this gave the starting-point for the conception of Hymenæus and Philetus,[1] that this was the only resurrection to be thought of. Despite of Paul's doctrine of the spiritual body — a doctrine even now but very poorly appreciated in the church — the Jewish notion of a resuscitation of the buried body from the grave very thoroughly penetrated the primitive church, as the writings of the Fathers abundantly show, embracing in its anticipations even the teeth, the nails and the hair. This doctrine, always the scandal of philosophy, as well as a perversion of Scripture, drove men into that one-sided view which Paul here condemns, which gives no place to the Christian conception of the spiritual body of the future, and fixes attention exclusively on a present rising (already accomplished) to higher views of truth, and higher ideals of life. This Paul regards as an "overthrow of faith," because by refusing to look at the *crown* in the future it enfeebles the energy of the race to be run in the present.

[1] We must locate these two at or near Ephesus, which tradition makes the place of Timothy's ministry.

NOTE C.

ON DAVID'S RESURRECTION.

For David is not ascended into the heavens : but he saith himself, The LORD said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand. (Acts ii. 34.)

In what Peter here says, a contradiction may appear to the statements advanced above respecting the resurrection of pious men before Christ, as well as since. I think it is unquestionable that Peter supposed David to be still in *Sheol*, or the grave (mistranslated "hell").

He draws a sharp distinction here, in applying the words of Psalm xvi. 10, between Christ who is risen, and David who is not. Christ, in his view, was not left in the grave, but David was. This being evidently Peter's opinion, the only question is, What account must be made of it ?

It may help us to answer, if we ask, What account must we make of the statement in Psalm cxv. 17, "The dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down into silence" ? No Christian is willing to adopt that as a statement of the truth, or of his own belief. There has been a progress of doctrine since that time. Later utterances of the Bible correct the earlier.

There is reason to class Peter's assertion about David with the assertion of the 115th Psalm about the dead. Peter's case may be described in Pastor John Robinson's remark about the Protestant churches in his times : "It is not possible the Chris-

tian world should come so lately out of such thick anti-Christian darkness, and *that full perfection of knowledge should break forth at once.*" Peter stood at Pentecost on the threshold of his apostolic career. He did not then know all that he was ever to know. He had not gotten clear of all his Jewish notions in a flash. He was inspired, but not omniscient, not infallible, any more than the writer of the 115th Psalm. We must apply to his statement about David the same principle that we apply to the statement of that Psalm about the dead, namely, *The Bible is a self-correcting book.* This remark of Peter is not our only source of knowledge about David's resurrection.

In view of the abundant superseding testimony which we have found in the Gospels and Epistles, it cannot stand, any more than the statement in Ecclesiastes (ix. 5) that "the dead know not anything," or any more than Dr. Watts's hymn based on that passage can stand, though it used to be sung in the churches not long ago, as I well remember.

> "'The living know that they must die,
> But all the dead forgotten lie ;
> Their memory and their sense is gone,
> Alike unknowing and unknown."

There is a deal of false doctrine still sung out of our popular hymn-books about the advent, the resurrection, and the judgment, which is destined to be put quietly away, some time, to keep company on the shelf with the above stanza.

NOTE D.

ON THE END OF THE WORLD AT THE DAY OF THE LORD.

But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up.

Seeing then *that* all these things shall be dissolved, what manner *of persons* ought ye to be in *all* holy conversation and godliness,

Looking for and hasting unto the coming of the day of God, wherein the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat?

Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness. (2 Pet. iii. 10–13.)

It is noteworthy that Christ never referred to an end of the physical world. The Greek has two words of different signification, each of them rendered in English as "world." One of these is *æon* (*αἰών*), signifying a period, or a connected system of causes and effects with peculiar characteristics, continuing through such a period. We use "world" in the same sense, when we speak of the Gentile world, the Jewish world, the heathen world, the literary, or religious, or political world, the world of our forefathers, etc. This word *æon* is the one which Christ employs in all his references to "the end of the world," signifying thereby, nothing more

than the end of the period preparatory to his enthronement through the spread of the Gospel.

The other Greek word for world is *kosmos* (κόσμος), which denotes sometimes the heavens and earth collectively, sometimes the earth only, then the inhabitants of earth, as in our phrase, "all the world," *i. e.* everybody. It is the end of the *kosmos* which Peter is prophesying, an idea which is utterly wanting in the teachings of Christ. This idea of the destruction of the *kosmos* by fire appears in the speculations of the Greek philosophers, as well as in the apocalyptic literature of the Jews prior to Christ. It is very plain from the course of thought in this chapter, that Peter — if we may assume the disputed point of Peter's authorship of the Second Epistle — regards the grand catastrophe of the physical universe at the coming of the Lord as close at hand, since he addresses his argument to those who might be troubled by its delay.

No clearer proof than this can be looked for, that the Apostles occasionally misinterpreted their Master. It is clear that in such a passage as this the Apostle does not speak infallibly. That he speaks as an inspired man, is also clear from the elevated spiritual tone of his exhortation to Christian earnestness, faith and diligence. It is in the *moral* characteristics of the Apostles' writings that the evidences of their inspiration are found.

CHAPTER IX.

THE RESURRECTION A DEVELOPMENT, NOT A MIRACLE.

"Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life, and I will raise him up in[1] the last day." — *John* vi. 54.

In bringing to a close our present study of the resurrection, the main conclusions thus far reached must be carried in mind. The resurrection is not a far off event of the future, but a continuous process now going on in the invisible world. But resurrection, the same as life, is a word which has a higher meaning and a lower, a full sense and a bare sense. In any case, it denotes *entrance into embodied existence in a future state.* But that entrance may be either into what is bare existence, described in terms expressing its poverty and destitution, or into what is full existence, described in terms expressing its richness and completeness, and emphatically termed "LIFE." Which of these is the future portion of the

[1] For the substitution here of "in" for "at," see page 212.

spirit, depends on Christian endeavor, in a normal and necessary relation to Christ, as the resurrection power, the source, morally speaking, of spiritual well-being, or "life." The New Testament urges us to such endeavor for the resurrection, by living as Christ lived, so as to rise as Christ rose. For this depends on *fitness* to rise, on a personal possessing of the Christly capacity and power for what Paul calls "life indeed."[1]

The chief remaining question on the general subject concerns the *manner* in which Christ's resurrection power works its effect. "*How* are the dead raised?" This is even a more central question than that which we have already considered at such length, *When* are the dead raised? We are now better prepared to appreciate the answer which our Lord's words, quoted at the beginning of this chapter, unfold to thought. This answer will not only give us confidence in the conclusions already reached. What is of still further importance, it will manifest the resurrection as *a consistent part of the orderly system of God's works.* And

[1] This is the true reading in 1 Tim. vi. 19, where the common version reads "eternal life."

from the nature of Christ's agency as the resurrection power it will show Christ's indispensableness to us for the conditions of the resurrection hope.

Premising now that resurrection means, in any view of it, entrance into a newly *embodied* existence of some kind, let the sharp discrimination already drawn be well kept in mind, between resurrection in the full Christian sense, as entrance into well conditioned and blessed *life*, the fruit of spiritual endeavor, and resurrection in the bare and privative sense, as entrance into existence which is devoid of the fruit of such endeavor. All *exist* hereafter, not all *live;* all are in being, not all in *well*-being, save so far as endeavor has prepared the conditions of well-being, as in the present world. The New Testament rarely speaks of resurrection except in the Christian sense, because it is to Christians that the New Testament speaks. We are now prepared to see that the resurrection which is the object of Christian hope is not a miraculous new creation, but *the normal development* of that life in the spiritual body, which is endued with power and glory by the power of Christ.

The manner in which his power produces that effect will appear as soon as his words already quoted are put under the lens of discriminating thought: "Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life, and I will raise him up in the last day."

I. Look first at the main outlines of this statement. *Food* is mentioned first, to which the flesh and blood of Christ are compared in a sense that will be hereafter considered. From food comes *life*, and we are told that from that peculiar food comes a peculiar life; whoso eats it "hath eternal life." Life tends to *advancement* of some kind, and this peculiar life tends to a peculiar advancement, or exaltation: "I will raise him up." Thus, in the main outlines of this great saying, these three ideas — food, life, advancement — appear in the same orderly succession in which we find them in the world. They follow each other in a connection of natural development, like the parts of a plant — root, stem and leaves, flower. The resurrection is stated as resulting from what has gone before, as the outcome and flower of *vital processes*. It is the consequent, which, under the laws of spiritual life, grows from such antecedents.

With the idea thus outlined of a resurrection which comes through an orderly development of a spiritual effect from a spiritual cause, compare the traditional notion as reflected in the hymn-books. There is to be a penetrating, world-resounding call, a summons irresistible, compelling the assembling of all spirits in a mass, angelic trumpeters marshaling mankind in ranks before a throne, Paradise for the time emptied of its holy population, and Gehenna of its wretched multitudes, to stand for a brief time in a judgment concourse, and all these newly and simultaneously provided with bodies, which since the moment of death they had lacked till then, bodies innumerable, all built "in a moment, in the twinkling an eye;" out of that mortal dust, or some fraction of it, that had once belonged to the form of flesh and blood. This is the traditional idea, but we may be absolutely certain it was not our Lord's idea. His idea, as outlined in his own words, is that of a *growth from within;* the traditional idea is that of an *operation from without.* Our Lord's thought is of a *development;* the thought of the creeds is of a *miracle.*

Amid the contradictions with which mod-

ern thought assails the creeds it has become of great importance to form, if we can, a true idea of our relation to Christ as the resurrection power, and to understand what sort of agency he asserts when he declares, "I AM the Resurrection and the Life." Unless we can have a rational idea of this, how can we have any but an irrational faith, — a saving faith, indeed, but extremely puerile?

It is a fact beyond question, that the common notion of Christ's agency in the resurrection directly tends to create skepticism, and rejection of the Gospel of life through Christ. That notion is patterned after the scene at the grave of Lazarus, where Jesus stood and "cried with a loud voice, 'Lazarus, come forth.' And he that was dead came forth." This instance of simple *resuscitation* is taken as a type of *resurrection*.[1] This act of supernatural power in recalling the spirit into a body four days dead is "enlarged," as the photographers say, into a vast picture of Omnipotence suddenly reconstructing bodies, and reuniting them to spirits, in a simultaneous *operation* upon every individual of the million

[1] See Note B, chapter iii.

millions whom death has unclothed of flesh and blood. This notion is patterned after ideas of God's mode of working which modern thought has forever discarded, and which, whenever Christian men present them, only furnish fuel to skepticism. Those who still persist in presenting such notions as the teaching of Christ are simply hindering the Gospel which they would gladly promote. It is a duty, which we owe our Lord, to show that his Gospel is not responsible for fictions that are absurdly ascribed to it.

With the general idea now in mind, which our Lord's words have enabled us to outline, that the resurrection is a development *from within us*, we have to observe, next, that: —

II. This agrees with facts which our present form of existence discloses. It is said, very truly, that a body is given to every spirit in the resurrection. But the same is true of our life in this world. Of every kind of organized life in this world it is true, as Paul says of the seed which germinates, "God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him." (1 Cor. xv. 38.) But *how* does God give that body? Simply through the methods, or laws, of organic growth,

which he has ordained, and through which he works. A vital power, derived originally from the divine source of all life, is in the germ, and this *builds up its own body* by assimilating the matter which it finds appropriate. We need not here affirm whether the vital power which builds the present body is in one or another element of our being. Whether it be in "matter," or in "soul," or in "spirit," it is enough that it is present, for the energy of *life* is the body-building power. Simply because the tiny germ is *alive*, it involves "the promise and the potency" of the fully developed organism. The body thus formed is none the less "given" by God, none the less a work of God, for being given through the mediation of a body-building power operating according to natural laws of growth. Its constitution is as divinely effected as if it had sprung into mature completeness at a fiat of Omnipotence.

Now our conviction of the invariableness with which God works through law impels us to regard God's *way* of giving us bodies through the operation of organic laws in this world, as indicating the *way* in which he will give us bodies in the next world. We

see that God gives bodies by giving to existing life the power to form bodies. Within the mother's body life forms a new body in the babe, whose body is, during the formative processes, a part of the mother's body, while unfolding toward a distinct and separable individual existence. Is it a gratuitous fancy that here may be somewhat analogous to the formation of the spiritual body, beginning possibly even here under the physical? We need hazard nothing beyond the question. The general fact that *life*, wherever it appears, appears to be a *body-builder*, determines us toward some general conclusion. We cannot entertain any such notion as that living spirits will remain for ages disembodied, and then all at once will be clothed with bodies by an almighty fiat. The only reasonable and consistent view is this: The spirit which goes through the death gate into the future is a *living* thing. Whatever the origin of its life, the essential fact is that it *has* life. Now we must assign to life everywhere the power which we see it manifesting here. If life existing in a human germ here is found building its own body, life existing in a human spirit here or there will be

found no less able to build itself a body. Very probably, for aught we know, it begins to build the spiritual body here behind the screen of flesh and blood, just as plant life, while forming the seed under the husk, begins to form within the seed the leaflets that are to unfold into the future plant.

Of what substance the spiritual body is we know not. In what manner formed we know not. But that the body-building power is an inalienable prerogative of life cannot be doubted. What sort of a *body* the living spirit shall build, or is building, is a question we may well be content to postpone for the far more important question which each of us is required to settle by his own action, namely: *What sort of a spirit is it* that builds that mysterious house of the future? In this question it begins at length to dawn on us what is our necessary relation to Christ as the resurrection power, when we perceive that he, by his truth and love and righteousness, develops and perfects *the spirit* that is to form and adapt to itself the spiritual body.

III. What this relation to Christ is, is vividly set forth in his saying already quoted: "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my

blood hath eternal life, and I will raise him up in the last day." The figure is intense, because an intense thought has to be carried. Christ must be in us, inwrought into us, the very "soul of the soul." How else could this have been so luminously expressed as by the striking figure of eating his flesh and drinking his blood? As the food we eat and drink carries nourishment into every part of the body, so that there is not one tiny cell where it is not built into the very substance of our frame, so must Christ, that is to say, Christ's Divine Spirit of truth and love and righteousness, mingle with the current of our own spiritual life, carrying the power of his Divine life into all our affections and thoughts and determinations. This is, of course, a process, a growth. He symbolized it as such, and reiterated the very idea now before us, when he said, "I am *the vine*, ye are *the branches*." (John xv. 5.) To have this growth constantly advancing, never arrested, complete, not partial, is the object of that endeavor, already insisted on, which distinguishes a real Christian from a nominal one.

(1.) What now is the *development* which this growth unfolds *from the beginning on-*

ward? "Such a man," says our Lord, "hath eternal life." This does not mean, has a prospect of existing forever,[1] but *has*, has *now*, that *kind* of life which is, in the nature of things, capacitated for well conditioned existence in any and all worlds and times. Evidently he has it, for he has the Christly spirit, whose truth and love and righteousness *are* the eternal powers, which involve the highest development of life both in the present and the future. And what follows from the fact that he who has the Christly spirit has the eternal life? This: "I will raise him up in the last day." This must follow, for he has that in him which must rise, even the Christ. While he lives in flesh and blood, such a man may say with Paul: "I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me." (Gal. ii. 20.) And when the earthly tabernacle dissolves, he may still speak in the same spirit of fellowship with the Lord of his life: "I rise, yet not I, but Christ riseth in me." How manifest that our Lord's idea of his resurrection power is that

[1] In the popular notion, eternal life is assumed to mean the same as endless existence. Granting that it *extends* to endless existence, its primary meaning is not a certain *amount*, but a certain *kind* of existence, *quality*, not quantity of existence. (See John xvii. 3; 1 John v. 11, 12. See, also, p. 179.)

of an agency operating not from without us, but from within! The *cause* of the eternal life which the man has, the *cause* of his being raised up in the last day, is the Christ, not as descending from heaven in clouds, with dazzling light and miraculous energies, but as "*eaten*" and "*drunk*" by the man who keeps the word, and cherishes the love, and lives in the spirit, of Christ, and thus builds Christ into his own spirit, as the energizing and developing principle of his life. He must rise, therefore, because Christ is in him. His resurrection is therefore not a physical but a spiritual fact, the development and flower of spiritual growth. The risen spirit carries, as every spirit carries, *the life* whose essential property it is to build and organize a body to itself. But, what is of vastly greater consequence, this life, building the spiritual body, is *the Christian life*, capacitated eternally, that is, in the nature of things, independently of all space and time relations, for vigor, health, blessedness, and moral glory.

This is the spiritual and Christian, as distinct from the mechanical and Jewish, idea of the resurrection, as THE ENTRANCE INTO THAT PERFECTED STATE OF EMBODIED BE-

ING WHICH IS THE SPIRITUAL RESULT OF A CHRISTLY LIFE IN THE PRESENT WORLD. In a superficial point of view, it is the manifestation of the spirit in a new body. In the central and vital point of view, it is the manifestation of the *well conditioned* spirit, the Christly spirit, that builds itself a body appropriate to its condition. This is not only resurrection, it is RESURRECTION AND LIFE. And here at length we have reached the full significance of that great saying of our Lord, at which we began our study of this subject: "I AM THE RESURRECTION AND THE LIFE."

(2.) What "the first resurrection" probably is (Rev. xx. 5, 6), begins to appear at this point. When we conceive of that resurrection and life, just spoken of, as realized immediately after death, when we think of holy men, like Moses and Elijah, like Paul and John, rising up, through the Christ-life in them, into the fullness of spiritual well-being in the spiritual body, we have found a place for that doctrine of "the first resurrection" which has dropped out of Christian thought, through that mechanical misinterpretation which attributes it, as a special privilege, to the martyrs.

"The first resurrection" is not the getting of new bodies before others, but rising into life, or well-being, before others. New bodies are insured to all, as soon as the former bodies drop off, but the strong and glorious Christly *life* in the new or spiritual body is assigned only to the holy: "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection; on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ [engaged in ministrations of divine grace to others], and shall reign [as the loving always reign] with him a thousand years." The period of a thousand years assigned to this "reign" Christian thought will not measure by a fixed number of the earth's revolutions about the sun, but will regard as simply a period of vast and indefinite duration. It is *the resurrection period* that has been already described (chap. viii) as corresponding to *the Gospel period*.[1] While "the Gospel of life" is here

[1] This will be found stated with more precision in Note C, appended to this chapter. I deem the thousand years to be, not the whole of the gospel period, but that part of it which includes the whole *development* of Christianity, the period of the *growth* of the kingdom of Christ, from its initial to its final conflict and victory. For a fuller explanation see the Note referred to.

("in the last day," or Christian stage of history) preparing us for "the resurrection of life," those who are made fit, through Christ, to rise in Christ are continually rising into the Christly life beyond the grave. But Christian thought cannot regard the blessedness of this first resurrection as limited to the martyrs, for whose encouragement John originally prophesied it — "the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus," etc. Whether or no the prophet's thought, in his light, were as full as our thought, in our light, is a question quite unimportant to raise here. Such a resurrection as is possible for us to believe in cannot be dependent on any such external and accidental circumstance, as whether a man were beheaded for being a Christian. It must be equally the inheritance of all who have the spirit of him whom the prophet calls "the faithful witness," [1] the Christly spirit of self-sacrifice and faith.

IV. Our study has now brought us to a point where but little, if any, doubt can remain, which of two answers we must give to the question, *What is the resurrection?*

(1.) The common answer is: It is the

[1] Literally, "the faithful *martyr*, *i. e.* Christ." (Rev. i. 5.)

giving of a new body to a spirit which death stripped of its former body, and left waiting in a disembodied state.

According to this answer, the essential thing in the resurrection is *the body*, for which the spirit waits, in a state of privation, and which is finally furnished to it by a power from without itself through a divine fiat and miracle. Moreover, this reëmbodiment is spoken of as "the general resurrection," one and the same event to all at the same moment, simply the simultaneous refurnishing of all waiting spirits with bodies. In this view it is hard to know what Christ meant, when he spoke of those "who shall be accounted *worthy* to obtain the resurrection," or what Paul meant, in speaking of his *struggle* to "attain unto the resurrection." For worthiness, or struggle to attain, is out of the question in anything that is to be a general event to all.

(2.) The answer toward which our study tends is this: Resurrection is the entrance into embodied existence, after death, of the spirit to which God has given the power of building for itself the spiritual body. *The* resurrection, in the Christian and ideal sense of the word, is the entrance of the

Christly spirit, with that power, into an embodied existence which is "life indeed." So far as present endeavor can bring it to pass that "Christ is formed within" us as "the hope of glory" (Gal. iv. 19; Col. i. 27), so far the resurrection is a thing of present determination, and, potentially, of present attainment. This seems to be the thought which underlies Paul's expressions in his letter to the Philippians. (III. 11, 12.)

According to this answer, the essential thing in the resurrection is *the spirit*, with its character and its corresponding capacity and power. The body is not left out, but is the product of the spirit's life. The spirit is not left without a body in a middle state of arrested development, but unfolds the constructive power of its life, without arrest, in forming its own body. No universal miracle is demanded to form new bodies on the instant by the million million. Instead of a *physical operation* from without, a *spiritual growth* from within builds the habitation and organ of each spirit, according to the endeavor of each in obedience to the laws of vital development in spiritual health. Does not the fact that the resurrection is made so prominent in what the

Fathers called "the spiritual gospel" of John, speak something for this view of the resurrection?

In this view of the resurrection, it is, as Christ and Paul and John have taught, not the same general event to every individual. It depends on what the *spirit* is, and on what it has become by its life in this world. And so, as we are expressly instructed, *the* resurrection is the grand object of Christian endeavor. The duty of striving to "attain unto the resurrection of the dead" now becomes intelligible. We see that we must live as Christ lived here, in truth and love and righteousness, so as to *establish the vital conditions* for rising there into a true, strong, and healthful existence, according to the Christly pattern of the life eternal.

Let the reader judge which of these is likely to be the true answer to the question, *What is the resurrection?* — the one which is mainly concerned about the providing of a new *body*, or the one which looks rather to the condition of the *spirit* that carries the body-building power. Which best accords with the positively known and fundamental fact, that God works in a method of development, and with continuity of prog-

ress? Which best accords with the fact, that Christ's idea of the resurrection seems to be that of a spiritual development rather than a physical operation, an inward process rather than an outward event, a power manifested rather in an orderly growth than in a miraculous explosion? Which best discloses our necessary relation to Christ as the resurrection power amid the preparatory processes of the present life?

V. The subject of the present chapter, The Christian Resurrection as a Spiritual Development from within, has thus far been studied on the positive side. To bring out the truth with the emphasis due to the subject, the negative or privative side should now come up for contrast.

What if this spiritual development be neglected, interfered with, distorted? What of those in whom the Christly power of well conditioned life is deficient or absent? They live hereafter, but *how?* The spirit forms its own body, but *what* spirit? On the spirit all depends. We are sufficiently familiar with the phrases of Holy Scripture: "indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish," "castaway," "reprobates," "the worm that dieth not and the fire that is

not quenched." What else can we know, or forecast, that can invest these general terms with greater definiteness in our thought?

If one principle is applied in our studies more frequently than any other, it is this: to divine God's unknown procedures by observing the known. Apply it in this present question as to the influence of antecedent life upon subsequent life. Death is our birth into subsequent life. Our life before that birth has what effect on our life after?

Must we not reflect here on what we know of lives in this world that are weak or distorted, miserable or depraved, because of what we call "ante-natal conditions"? The body-building life power was interfered with, or was deficient, before birth, and lo! that interference or defect, brief as it was, manifests its effects in years of ill conditioned life. One is deaf and dumb, or blind, or a cripple, or insane, or idiotic. He lives, but his living is *life* only in part. The ill condition is grievous enough, though he himself is not to blame for it. But what if he were to blame? What if self-reproach were added to the life-long burden under which he groans? How little of *life* would there be in such living!

The suggestion reveals a cluster of conjectures that we must deem more than mere possibilities. What are the precise limits of the analogy, we cannot affirm. But that here is an analogy, and a most instructive one, can hardly be denied. Seeing how our present life has been *permanently conditioned by causes transiently operating* under the laws of preparatory growth, we can hardly resist the persuasion, that the laws of spiritual growth now operating in our life are to develop enduring conditions out of the transient antecedents that we now have the power to determine.

No one, therefore, who perceives and intelligently reflects on the ante-natal causes which determined the defective, distorted, crippled, impotent sort of life, that we see so much of in this world, can avoid putting to himself such questions as these: What if I allow a skeptical habit to quench the faith-faculty, the eye of the soul? What if the ear of obedience to the Divine law be unformed in a will disloyal to right? What if conscience, the moral reason, become beclouded or subverted? What if the understanding be not informed and regulated by truth? What if selfishness

spread its scrofula through the vital currents of feeling and thought? Must not such sins against the laws of spiritual life *leave their enduring mark* in ill conditions of the future life? If the interference of only a few days or hours with the normal processes of life before our mortal birth can perpetuate its evil in defects of body and mind to the full term of old age, what perpetuation of evil may not the present transmit to the future from violations of the Divine law that we may commit in forming the spirit which is to be born at death into the hereafter? The gross fancy of some of the Jews, that the buried body itself should be raised again with all its defects and blemishes reproduced, may really have a side of truth to it, as a picture of the entrance of spirits into the future life deficient and distorted, impotent through moral weaknesses, blind through unbelief, deaf through disobedience and wilfulness, insane because incapable of recognizing truth, leprous with selfishness. Beside this, remorse for self-inflicted mischief. Beside this, shame.

For what must we infer, when we see, further, that even the form of flesh and blood is gradually penetrated by the expres-

sion of the spirit which it screens? How even plain faces become transfigured with the beauty of loving souls! How even classic features become overcast with the gross look of the sensual, or the hard look of the selfish, spirit! Much more must the spiritual body be like a transparent medium to reveal the character of the indwelling spirit that has formed it. Then must the word of the Lord be fulfilled to the uttermost: "There is nothing covered that shall not be revealed." (Luke xii. 2.) Screens of flesh and blood are withdrawn. "The books" are "opened." The self-registry is apparent. The work of the spirit is made manifest. And what is this but misery and shame to the ill conditioned, *whose sin expresses itself in what they are?* What is this but a revelation of judgment[1] upon "the deeds done in the body," which are apparent, not as *past actions*, but as a *present net result* in an existing spiritual condition? And what can we call such ill conditioned births into the world of resurrection — with the formative processes of truth and love and righteousness so ill wrought, or unwrought, but entrance into an existence that is not

[1] See page 142

life? — what is it but "the resurrection of judgment"?

Our wisdom on this subject is found less in utterance than in silence, as soon as we attempt to pass from general principles to particulars. We see, of course, that either godliness or ungodliness must be the general character of every spirit; that is to say, that the *prevailing* inclination and tendency of every one must be either toward God, or away from him, that there can be no such thing as moral indifference toward God, inclining neither way. But whether, in these two main divisions of *character*, there *can* be, as most pulpits teach, and as most Christians believe, only *two sorts of experience*, complete blessedness and utter wretchedness; whether there *can* be only two conditions, complete well-being and utter ill-being; whether, even among "saints," there will not be imperfect ones; whether crooked, stunted, weak, and faulty growths, transplanted from earth's nursery to Paradise, will not find defects of blessedness and drawbacks of advancement, corresponding to a merely partial fitness for the "resurrection of life;" are questions that are destined to receive more thoughtful considera-

tion than the indiscriminate positiveness of the creeds has thus far encouraged.[1] But amid all such questions, to which the experience of the future realities will bring, there is reason to think, some unanticipated replies, one principle may be held with absolute certainty, as the fundamental law of consequences under which all life is lived: "WHATSOEVER A MAN SOWETH, THAT SHALL HE ALSO REAP." Any view of the future that harmonizes with this may be true; any that conflicts with it must be false.

Enough for the negative aspect. The contrast adds fresh emphasis to the positive side of the truth, so conspicuous in Holy Scripture. There the laws of spiritual life are revealed, that we may obey them, and through obedience rise into the fullness of life. There the divine pattern of humanity is set before us in Christ Jesus our Lord. He himself, in his truth and love and right-

[1] The Westminster Assembly's Shorter Catechism teaches (§ 37) that "the souls of believers are at their death made perfect in holiness;" that is, *all* believers, one as much as another, to whatever greater or less degree sanctification has spread through their character in this life, find themselves, so far as the sanctification of character is concerned, *equalized by dying*. *All* "are at their death made perfect in holiness."

eousness, is commended to us as the inwardly working resurrection power. His sympathy with our struggle in our weakness stands before us in the symbol of his cross, to draw us to the beginning of an eternal fellowship in life with him. "Glory, honor, and immortality," in a perfected spiritual nature, after the pattern of Christ, are held out to us as the future flower of a present fellowship and following with him. The preparation time, how brief! The fruition time, how boundless! how blessed! Let Faith hear: let Reason judge. O Divine Hope! O Divine Helper! Oh, happy they who hear his voice, and walk with him!

NOTE A.

ON THE THOUSAND YEARS, OR "MILLENNIUM."

And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them: and I *saw* the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshiped the beast, neither his image, neither had received *his* mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. (Rev. xx. 4.)

The idea of a millennial period of glory to come on

earth was cherished by the Jews prior to the time of Christ. "The Jews supposed that the Messiah at his coming would reign as king upon the earth, and would reside at Jerusalem, the ancient royal city. The period of his reign they supposed would be very long, and therefore put it down at a thousand years, which was at first understood only as a round number. . . . . This period was conceived of by the Jews as the return of the golden age to the earth, and each one formed to himself such a picture of it as agreed best with his own disposition, and that degree of moral and intellectual culture to which he had attained. Many anticipated nothing more than merely sensual delights; others entertained better and purer conceptions."

This millennial hope passed over from the Jews into the Christian church. It does not carry Christ's express indorsement in any of his recorded sayings. Yet, doubtless, some of his expressions might bear such a construction, and probably seemed to the Apostles an adequate sanction for holding on to their traditional millennial views in connection with the kingdom of which their Master spoke.

And I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me;

That ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel. (Luke xxii. 29, 30.)

For the study of another such saying of our Lord, and what we are probably to understand under the ideas of enthronement, judging and reigning, in the

millennial prophecies, see chapter v., note A, and remarks on page 238.

In John's Revelation the utterance of this ancient hope sounds like the old Jewish anticipations reviving in a more spiritualized form. "John does not there speak of Christ reigning visibly and bodily on the earth, but of his spiritual dominion, resulting from the influence of Christianity when it shall at length be universally diffused through the earth — a kingdom which will last a thousand years, used as a round number to denote many centuries, or a long period."

The admitted Jewish origin of the millennial hope, and the evident Jewish coloring which it carries even in John's mind, may disparage it in the view of some. But the fact that the Jewish nation was pervaded through its whole career till Christ appeared with a spirit of prophecy, of which abundant demonstration is furnished by Christ himself, may seem to others, as it certainly does to me, good ground for expecting to find some substantial Divine truth in the millennial prophecy of John under the shell of the local and temporary form.

NOTE. The quotations in the preceding paragraphs are from Knapp's "Christian Theology," page 538, Am. Ed. It will be noticed that Dr. Knapp regards the thousand years as denoting the whole period of Christ's kingdom on earth. That it refers rather to the period of the kingdom's growth and struggle, up to its final victory, but not to the whole period of the kingdom's existence, I have aimed to show in note C below.

NOTE B.

ON "THE FIRST RESURRECTION."

But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished. This *is* the first resurrection. (Rev. xx. 5.)

Upon this we have to observe : —

(1.) They "*lived not.*" Failure to prepare in the present life the conditions of this first resurrection (as described in the foregoing chapter) subjected them, for the period, to privation of that blessed condition which is, emphatically, *life*, or "life indeed."[1] Their existence is, for the period, here viewed as an experience of retribution for their unfitness for the resurrection of life, just as the whole period of a long earthly life is often burdened with retribution for violation of the laws of life during a few months or days before birth. This period, indefinite but vast, a much more reasonable as well as Scriptural conception than that of an endless hell, presents a motive of sufficient urgency to deter from present faithlessness all those whom foresight influences at all.

(2.) They "lived not *till* the thousand years were finished." This does not deny that they might live *after*, at least some of them. This suggests the possible recovery, at least of some, to life in Christ. This tallies with that hint of recovering processes which is found in the preaching of Christ to the "spirits in prison."[2] (1 Pet. iii. 19.) This com-

[1] See p. 225, Note.

[2] See chapter iii., Note D.

ports with that doctrine which Augustine derived from Matthew xii. 32, namely, "For it would not be truly said of some, that they are forgiven neither in this age nor in the future, were there not some who, though not in this, are forgiven in the future." Heathen *may* hear the gospel there, and there *may* prepare the conditions of ultimate resurrection to life. That all *will* do this is a conclusion that cannot be drawn with assurance from anything within the range of our experience, or from any testimony of the Scriptures.

(3.) Those who "lived not" are spoken of as a class, "*the rest.*" Into this class some are continually passing out of the present world. Whether others are emerging out of this class in a way of recovery, or what possibilities and opportunities there may be of any individuals of this class rising out of it into Christly life under the discipline of the future state, does not come into the view of the seer. His language is general. During that whole period *there is such a class*, whose description is, "they lived not." Changes of condition, if such are possible, affecting individuals who at any time are found in this class, are matter not of prophecy but of speculation.

(4.) It is not said that *all* of this class ("the rest of the dead") attained to life at or after the end of this resurrection period. Only that they, as a class, continued *till then* in a state of privation consequent upon their previous life. Of individuals nothing is suggested in any way. Nor is there any clear intimation here of an ultimate resurrection of life for *all*. We may believe that the recoverable will be recovered. But what of the irrecoverables? Will there be none such?

Here we reach the open door of a great question, presented by the doctrine of "conditional immortality." The Scriptures do not teach, and philosophy has, at the best, but uncertain ground on which to maintain, that all who have at any time existed will always continue to exist. The Apostle Paul, in four remarkable passages,[1] declares that unity, not dualism, is the ultimate state of the spiritual creation, — that *all who exist* will be ultimately in fellowship and spiritual unity with God. But there are strong reasons for believing that all who exist in that ultimate unity are not so many as all who have existed; that some will ultimately have ceased to exist, who have made themselves incapable of the eternal life.

NOTE C.

ON THE BINDING AND LOOSING OF SATAN, CONNECTED BY PROPHECY WITH THE FIRST RESURRECTION.

And I saw an angel come down from heaven, having the key of the bottomless pit and a great chain in his hand.

And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the Devil, and Satan, and bound him a thousand years,

And cast him into the bottomless pit, and shut him up, and set a seal upon him, that he should deceive the nations no more, till the thousand years should be fulfilled: and after that he must be loosed a little season.

. . . . . .

[1] See Note C, chapter v.

And when the thousand years are expired, Satan shall be loosed out of his prison,

And shall go out to deceive the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them together to battle: the number of whom *is* as the sand of the sea.

And they went up on the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city: and fire came down from God out of heaven, and devoured them. (Rev. xx. 1–3, 7–9.)

This vision, like the Apocalypse in general, is intensely realistic. Its introduction, describing the restraint of the world-deceiving spirit, connects plainly enough with certain sayings of Christ, namely, "I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven" (Luke x. 18); "Now shall the prince of this world be cast out." (John xii. 31.) Paganism being the grand obstacle which the Gospel of the kingdom had to remove, the binding and casting out of Satan into "the abyss"[1] (common version, "bottomless pit,") undoubtedly represents the restraint and suppression of the deluding spirit of Paganism during the Gospel period.

The term, "the nations," uniformly denotes, in the New Testament, *heathen* nations. If, instead of "nations," we translate the original word in this

[1] The word "abyss" (ἄβυσσος) corresponds to the Hebrew *t'hōm*, uniformly applied in the Old Testament to raging or roaring watery depths, whether of the ocean or of streams and floods. In the New Testament it is occasionally translated "the deep." (See Luke viii. 31; Rom. x. 7.) It here appropriately designates, in a shadowy way, the proper home of rebellious and turbulent spirits.

place by "heathen," as is done in Gal. i. 16, the reasonableness of taking the vision to signify the suppression of Paganism will be more apparent. The reference of the vision is, of course, at least primarily, to the nations known to the writer, the Mediterranean nations, at that time all of them Pagans.

This suppression we must, of course, think of as having its development from a small beginning upward to its completeness, just as we conceive of the Gospel and the kingdom of Christ, in its opposition to Paganism, developing from its germ to its complete supremacy.

If this be the correct view, then the loosing of Satan can signify nothing but the revival of Paganism, in some form or other, at the end of "the thousand years" — a period not of that precise number of the earth's annual revolutions round the sun, but of vast and indefinite duration, the period of Christianity in its triumphs over the old Paganism, triumphs that are still in progress. The idea of this revival of Paganism is here externalized in vision as a gathering of the hordes of barbarians from the then unknown north ("Gog and Magog" — as in Ezekiel xxxviii and xxxix), for a devastating invasion of the Holy Land.

Of course it is impossible to regard this as strictly representative of the actual reality that is to be. An irruption of northern heathen is not to be reckoned now, as in the time of John's writing, among the possible apprehensions of the civilized and Christianized world. The revival of Paganism, and Pagan assaults, must be anticipated in a form that

is modified correspondingly with the changed condition of the world.

The essence of Paganism is in the deification of nature and its various powers, including man. To the Pagan, matter and its manifestations are everything, and spirit nothing but a phantom or a superstition. Is nothing like this beginning to be apparent in the midst of Christian civilization? The modern Paganism is what we call *Materialism.* The Paganism of the past will not rise again, to rebuild its crumbling temples. The revived Paganism will redden no altars with the blood of victims. Its only shrine will be the laboratory ; its supreme being, matter ; its demigods, the forces in matter ; but in hostile scorn for what it deems the fables of Christianity it will rival the ancient worshipers of Jupiter and of the divinized Cæsars.

The gathering of "the nations" (or heathen) in the four corners (common version, "quarters") of the earth is wholly symbolical. This mode of picturing the revival of Paganism is due to the fact that the old Paganism retired before the expanding power of Christianity toward those "corners," in all directions, like an ebbing tide. Hence a revival of Paganism is represented as a return of the tide from thence. Making this allowance for the form in which the vision is cast, we shall deem ourselves released from the difficult supposition of an irruption of Pagans from Pagan lands, and shall follow the indications, already apparent, that the reality will be a development of a modern Paganism within the bounds of nominal Christendom itself. The last and subtlest assault of the enemy of Christ will not

be made from without but from within the domain from which he has been banished in form only to return in spirit. In the new form of the reviving Paganism will lie its hopes and its strength. Its "last card" will be confidently played. Its weapons will no longer be such as mangle the flesh of martyrs, but all the improved modern artillery of science will be appropriated by the spirit of Atheism.

Once more, we are not to literalize the vision so as to think of this as coming on suddenly. Nothing is sudden in the development, through conflict, of the kingdom of God. The ebb of the Pagan tide was gradual, and gradual will be its return, its phenomena slowly spreading before coming to a head in ripeness for conclusive judgment.

But, especially, we must not think of this last conflict of Christianity as a turning back of the onward career of the kingdom, as if Christianity had failed through any waning of its power, or as if a gigantic apostasy had left only a faithful few exposed to a host "like the sand of the sea." There can be no retrograde movement in the development of the kingdom of God. This last conflict with Paganism is to be thought of rather as the last stage of the long development of Christianity into its ideal character, and as the means to its consummate manifestation as the religion of the spirit. Furthermore, we are not to think of the final victory as wrought by a Divine *interference* from without ("fire from God out of heaven"), but as secured by a Divine *development* from within.

To put the issue in plain thought before us, let us

reflect how, even now, as ever since the beginning, religion, with comparatively few exceptions, is *externalized* in forms of church organization, and forms of ritual, and forms of doctrine. No fault is to be found with this externalization of religion, so long as it is needed as an education to what is higher, but only when it contends for perpetuity, after having served its temporary need as scaffolding. But when we reflect on the stress that is laid even now on religious *forms*, of order, ritual and dogma, as compared with the stress that is laid on religion as a Divine *life*, we are convinced that a long advance has yet to be made before Christianity manifests its essential life-power. The intellectual Paganism of to-day is not convinced by theological argument, or affected by ecclesiastical ritual. It is thoroughly impregnable to a religion that marches in the mediæval armor of forms. It easily makes head against a religion that is weakened by the sectarian divisions that insistance on forms creates. It can be vanquished only by the spiritual religion, whose unanswerable argument is its own baptism with the Holy Ghost, its transformation of character, its reproduction of the life of Christ among men.

The reviving Paganism must therefore be expected to spread, as things now are, its false prophets tracking the missionary among the heathen, and gathering proselytes from among dogmatists and ritualists at home, its denials becoming more scornful and more rampant, until, in the crisis, perhaps in some unprecedented "revival period," Christianity learns to suppress it forevermore, not with form and dogma and organization, but with a Divine life, the

life which is "baptized with the Holy Ghost and with fire." (Matt. iii. 11.) Then will the vision be fulfilled which showed that "fire came down from God out of heaven and devoured them." In this final victory Christianity will pass into its final stage, finding its unity, not in form, but in a holy character inspired with Divine love, and manifesting both its maturity and its power through spiritual life.

NOTE D.

"THE END."—"GOD ALL IN ALL."

Then *cometh* the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power.

For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet.

The last enemy *that* shall be destroyed *is* death.

For he hath put all things under his feet. But when he saith, All things are put under *him, it is* manifest that he is excepted, which did put all things under him.

And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all. (1 Cor. xv. 24–28.)

The view developed in this volume presents a resurrection that is now proceeding in the unseen world, and that shall be consummated when the mediatorial work of Christ is complete in the redemption of the race.

Of such a consummation the Apostle speaks in the passage now before us. Observe, at starting, that "the end" signifies, not a finality, but a consummation, not merely a *limit* which ends what has gone before, but a *threshold* beyond which opens a new stage of existence.[1] Where the work of the Mediator ends, there the reign of God without a Mediator begins. That God may reign without a Mediator, the Mediator, having finished his work of redemption, is represented as delivering his temporary sovereignty back to God.

To enlarge upon this somewhat mysterious prophecy, and to develop, so far as may be, all its suggestive hints, is not to the present purpose.

It does not seem to be the Apostle's object here to make any discrimination between different destinies, or to pronounce concerning the ultimate state of such as reject the Gospel. For a discussion of this point see Note C, chapter v.

So far as light is sought from this passage upon the doctrine of the Trinity, as to which it was a favorite with the Arians, nothing can be gathered beyond inferences that are more or less dubious. But so far as it is interrogated concerning the ultimate state of the moral universe, it seems to describe that state as *moral unity wholly centred in God*. According to the character of each individual, God will cause himself to be directly realized by each as the all-pervading and controlling power. But, in this connection, the language used of the subjection of refractory elements, "enemies,"

[1] This is the recognized sense of the Greek word, τέλος, "end".

seems to be less in harmony with the idea of universal restoration than with that of the ultimate perishing of the incorrigible and irrecoverable out of existence.

But, — specially, this prophecy of the end not only points to the ultimate consummation of the resurrection *period*, when the last of all who are to die shall have risen in the Christly life of the future, but it quite as certainly points to the consummation of each individual Christian's hope, as each attains "the end of faith in the salvation of the soul." (1 Peter i. 9.) The end, when God shall be "All in all" to each of the godly, is not to be waited for by every age till a definite point in the far-off future, any more than the resurrection is to be waited for. It is not chronology but spiritual capacity, not time but personal fitness, which determines that experience in the case of each godly spirit.

Paul, for instance, rising from the dead as soon as "the earthly house is dissolved," finds the moral conflict of this life (so intensely described in his sixth chapter to the Ephesians as involving even invisible powers) ended in the putting down of "all rule and authority and power" (verse 24) that hindered his struggle. For *him* "the last enemy is destroyed" (verse 26) when he has triumphed over death. And then, the process of redemption being complete *in him*, the mediatorial work and reign of Christ ends *for him*, as it will ultimately end for all. Through Christ he has come to God, and needs no longer a Great High Priest by whom to come. He has reached the end of seeing "through a glass darkly," and the beginning of seeing "face to

face." He has crossed the threshold of that career whose eternal course will be in perpetually learning of God and serving God, — in which the Son gives the first place, both in our knowledge and our service, to the Father, and "in all" of the redeemed GOD is "All" that each one needs.

CHAPTER X.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION.

"Jesus saith unto them, Have ye understood all these things? They say unto him, Yea, Lord.

"Then said he unto them, Therefore every scribe *which is* instructed unto the kingdom of heaven, is like unto a man *that is* a householder, which bringeth forth out of his treasure *things* new and old." — *Matt.* xiii. 51, 52.

THE course of thought followed in these studies upon the resurrection has been such as seemed to be required, in order to meet the difficulties existing in the way of any hoped-for change of mind from the Jewish to the Christian doctrine. The main points that have been made, with here and there some unavoidable diffuseness, as we have gone on, must now be more compactly put together in a brief review, and this may as well be in an order varying somewhat from that which we have followed.

I. The Jews in Christ's time possessed a well defined doctrine of a resurrection of the buried body, a coming of the Messiah, or Christ, in externalized glory, to raise the

dead, and a Divine judgment to be executed by him, at the resurrection, in bestowing favor and glory on his people, and inflicting retribution on the heathen and the ungodly. The Apostles, as Jews, had been imbued with this doctrine, and were naturally disposed to understand what our Lord said of the resurrection, his advent, and the judgment, in the externalizing sense in which these terms were then generally employed.

II. It cannot be denied by any one who is familiar with the ideas then entertained by the Jews upon these closely related doctrines of the resurrection, the advent, and the judgment, that the Apostles' language in reference to them is occasionally colored, and their opinions sometimes evidently biased by their traditional way of thinking; as when Paul speaks of the Lord Jesus as descending from heaven, and revealed in flaming fire; or as when Peter speaks of an impending conflagration of the heavens and the earth at the coming of the Lord, — precisely as the Jews held that a conflagration of the world would take place at the time of the resurrection and the judgment.

"The Apostles," says Professor A. A.

Hodge,[1] "understood these predictions to relate to a literal advent of Christ in person . . . . They teach that his coming will be visible and glorious, accompanied with the abrogation of the present Gospel dispensation, the destruction of his enemies, the glorification of his friends, the conflagration of the world, and the appearance of the 'new heaven and new earth.'" This satisfies the majority of Christians, as long as they do not inquire into *the source* whence the Apostles derived these ideas, as long as it is taken for granted that the Apostles derived them, *in that form*, from Christ. But as soon as it is perceived that this whole way of conceiving the subject of Christ's kingly advent and judgment originated before the time of Christ among Jewish writers, one has to ask whether Christ really set his seal to that way of thinking, whether he does not, indeed, require some of it to be corrected.

Nothing can be more plain to a candid mind, than that the Apostles' inspiration did not wholly emancipate them from this bias of inherited opinion, or lift them above all influence from their early prepossessions

[1] "Outlines of Theology," p. 448.

and ruling ideas, or make their language, reflecting such opinions, free from error, and an infallible guide. They believed they were living "in the end of the world," in "the last time," and spoke as men who thought that "the end of all things" was near. Peter evidently shared the universal belief of his countrymen that the pious dead were still, in a disembodied state, awaiting the advent of the Messiah's miraculous power to restore them to the normal condition of life in the union of body and spirit. Paul alone seems to have come to a more spiritual conception of the resurrection as a present reality, while his mode of speaking of the advent and the judgment reflects the Jewish idea of them, as events displayed in form and show to the senses.

III. The way of thinking current among the Apostles' countrymen, and essentially the same resulting conceptions in terms of physical rather than spiritual significance, have been preserved in the creeds down to the present time, and are now current with the majority of Christian believers, as any number of recent publications might be cited to testify.

So far, therefore, as the doctrine of the

resurrection is concerned, Christ's saying that the instructed "scribe," or teacher, brings forth things new as well as old, has hardly been verified thus far. The same may be said of the doctrine of the advent, and the doctrine of the judgment. The Christian church, as represented in its principal creeds and in the prevailing popular notions, has inherited from the ancient Jewish church, as represented, at least, by its more spiritual teachers, both its way of thinking and its conclusions upon these subjects with no *essential* modification.

IV. The following difficulties in the way of maintaining the traditional notions ought to be specially noted.

(1.) It is impossible to hold that our Lord's prophecies of his coming still wait for entrance upon a recognizable fulfillment, without provoking skeptical denials of his credibility that cannot be met, at least without arbitrary exegetical twists of language, and cannot be met at all on the fair ground of his plain assertion, that he would come as a king during the lifetime of some who heard him speak.

(2.) It is impossible to hold that resurrection — the reëntrance of the departing

spirit into embodied life in the spiritual world — is deferred to a day which is still future to all the dead, without suppressing the plainest testimony of our Lord to its present reality, through deference to the supposed infallibility of the Jewish opinions which color some of the language of the Apostles.

(3.) It is impossible to hold that the adequate judgment and retribution of the dead are deferred to some great and general court of God to be opened at a day still future, except (not to mention other grave objections) by an interpretation of our Lord's judgment picture in the twenty-fifth chapter of Matthew, that contradicts even the letter of his words, under the bias of a way of thinking upon the subject of the judgment, which likens the Divine method to that of the ordinary judge upon the bench.

V. It now remains only to point out the chief requisites in order to a true conception, at once Biblical and rational, of the doctrine of the resurrection in its necessary connection with the doctrines of the advent and the judgment.

(1.) To admit the fact that we can understand the Gospels as well as the Epistles,

our Lord's sayings as well as those of the Apostles, and to ground our doctrine less on the comments supplied by Paul and Peter than on the teachings of Christ himself, as capable of being adequately understood to-day without the intervention of any human mediator to interpret them, even though that mediator be an inspired Apostle.

(2.) To make allowance, in our study of the Epistles, for the element of inherited Jewish opinions occasionally so apparent in the language which the Apostles used concerning the grand facts of the kingdom of Christ.

(3.) To apply the discrimination between symbols and realities, which we have already learned to make in the Old Testament language concerning God — his "eyes," his "hand," his "nostrils" — to the New Testament language concerning the spiritual facts of the kingdom of God. We must carry this discrimination through the whole range of terms in which, for the sake of those who were to be taught, we find spiritual conceptions translated into material forms. *We must learn to translate them back again.*

(4.) To avail ourselves of whatever in-

sight the experience and the learning of the Christian centuries can give us into the method in which God works, under the universal reign of law, through processes of development, and with continuity of progress, — according to which Life is God's great body-builder, all physical, social and spiritual agencies are included among God's judgment "angels" for the elimination of evil, and Christ, as the earthly representative of God's moral perfections, presides, as the moral king, over the world's struggling development of a purified, saved and glorified humanity.

If we are disposed to harbor these considerations long enough to weigh them fairly, we shall begin to discover in such a line of thought what I believe is destined to become a growing conviction among reflecting men, that adherence to the old Jewish mode of thought concerning the resurrection, the Lord's advent, and the judgment has been the grand mistake which the church has made in its doctrine of the kingdom of Christ. In the ideal point of view, it is a monstrous anachronism in the period which Christians regard as "the Dispensation of the Spirit." In the practical point of view,

it provokes, as did the gross resurrection-fancies of the Pharisees, a development of Sadduceeism, disbelief in the Gospel of the resurrection, and skeptical denials of Christ as the resurrection power. Therefore, there must sometime come a reform of the church-doctrine of the resurrection, as taught in the creeds and the hymn-books. It is only a question of time.

Confident, therefore, as to the real point of our Lord's teaching as given in the Gospels, I earnestly commend it to the reconsideration of all those to whom the doctrine, so fundamental in the New Testament, of *resurrection through Christ*, possesses interest. The conception of this which is presented in these pages, criticised as it will be at present, is the one that will stand, at least in its essentials, when the fancies that are now widely entertained have been gathered into the museum of theological relics.

EAST OF THE JORDAN, AND OTHER BOOKS OF TRAVEL.

THE topography and archæology of "the Holy Land" are to Christians the most interesting in the world, and the names of the men who have written on them, from the times of the Talmudists, and Josephus, Abulfeda, and Edrisi, to our own, present such an array of genius that it is no small praise to Mr. Merrill to say that his book[1] merits a prominent place in the literature of the subject. It is indeed a matter for congratulation that, as American missionaries have taken the lead in practically reforming the East, Americans like Robinson have also been among the first to solve the problems of scriptural geography. There are now two societies, one English and one American, devoted to exploring Palestine, the former working in the east, which is comparatively well known and easily accessible, while our own is busy with the west, our author having labored for the latter. It has been asserted that this latter division is the least important and least interesting, and if Mr. Merrill had achieved nothing more than refuting this error, as he has most successfully, his work would still be of great value. Those who are not familiar with the works of De Vogué, Wetzstein, Guillaume, and others who have written on this region are generally under the impression that it is a mere desert, with a few decaying *tell* or mounds marking the site of ancient towers; when, on the contrary, it abounds with the magnificent remains of what were scores of splendid cities, nician, Greek, Græco-Roman, and Romanesque, to the Saracenic. Following W. H. Waddington, Mr. Merrill observes in this region the manner in which Græco-Syrian architects, with new social or religious needs, employed with grand logic the elements of the Græco-Roman orders, and developed from them the first stage of the Transition. Yet this region has been very rarely visited. Like Arles, "the best of it lies buried 'neath the ground," and immense archæological treasures await the excavator. There are the ruins of threescore great cities in the Hauran group, all of them covering, "as monkish writing covers older text," the remains of the very ancient cities of Bashan. "It is impossible to say how many layers of civilization may exist beneath any one of these towns."

We regret that our limits will not allow our giving the grounds, topographical and philological, on which Mr. Merrill identifies many of the sites of the Bible. In many cases he convinces, but in as many more this "identification" depends so much on fancied and forced resemblance to modern vulgar Arab words, and is conjectured through such an array of Talmudic, Arabic, and Greek substitutions of vowels and "daring guess-work," as would hardly hold good in law; so that we are tempted to write of it, "C'est magnifique, mais ce n'est pas la science." There is certainly much brilliant imagination displayed in proving that many places are the same as

ature, American aggressiveness would ever have honored them as social leaders. Character, not intellectual force, what republicans worship; but disconnted aspirants are parasites on society, hich adores literary mediocrity.

Common sense can never grant that nly a few know what society means, nough willing to confess that a few one understand the laws of convenonality. Republican common sense ares to adapt the means to the end, and it can have a jolly time in its own arlors, if it can think and read and rite papers and dance and sing, it is ot going to be told that it is not — soety. Each one is worth the whole of mself; it was thus with his ancestors, nd will be so with his descendants; very true democrat will create a little orld around himself by virtue of his vn being, whilst the old aristocrat will ppeal to inheritance and land. When ur presidents are often the unknown ird man, brought from comparative bscurity to retire again into mellowed ght; when presidents' wives cannot banish wine from the tables nor frizzles from the brows of the women, are Americans to talk of the power of society? The power of tact, of sympathy, of native force, of real intelligence, not of idle appreciation, is the only power that American individualism will ever consent to honor. Our high schools and the minimum examinations in colleges will make it more and more possible for cultured circles to exist on small incomes; a love for scholarship, enjoyment of great works, and perception of the opportunities that the simplest forms of nature offer for original research, even to the child botanist, will make literary life less a sham, power and money less a god, until good manners and simplicity of thought and life are as universal possessions in our republic as they are in our theories. Caste in its unkindest or most exclusive forms will gradually disappear in the reality of our living, though it may always remain as an undefined aroma from unknown distances. But society, — where is it? Everywhere.

Kate Gannett Wells.

PYRRHUS' RING.

I MARVEL much about this wondrous ring:
Plain gold the circlet, set with agate stone,
On which were graved, by Nature's craft alone,
Pierian streams and trees, Apollo king,
And all the Muses as in act to sing.
Not only was each lovely presence known
By form, and robe, and mien, but one would own
The lyre was there, nor wanting any string!

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 9999 10025 790 4

104
52
156